

Some fully nonlinear problems on manifolds with boundary of negative admissible curvature

Aobing Li* & Huan Zhu
 Department of Mathematics
 City University of Hong Kong
 83 Tat Chee Avenue
 Kowloon, Hong Kong

1 Introduction

Let (M^n, g) denote a compact smooth Riemannian manifold with no boundary of dimension $n \geq 3$. The Yamabe problem is to search a metric $\tilde{g}$ in the conformal class $[g]$ of g such that $\tilde{g}$ has a constant scalar curvature $R_{\tilde{g}} = c$. Write $\tilde{g} = u^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g$. The Yamabe problem is equivalent to solve

$$-L_g u = cu^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}, \quad u > 0 \quad \text{in } M, \quad (1)$$

where $L_g = \Delta_g - \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}R_g$ is the conformal Laplacian of g , and $c = -1, 0$, or 1 .

Let ϕ_1 be a positive eigenfunction of the first eigenvalue λ_1 of $-L_g$, i.e.

$$\lambda_1 = \inf_{\phi \in H^1(M) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_M |\nabla \phi|_g^2 + \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} R_g \phi^2 \, d\text{vol}_g}{\int_M \phi^2 \, d\text{vol}_g},$$

and $-L_g \phi_1 = \lambda_1 \phi_1$. A direct calculation yields that

$$R_{\phi_1^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g} = -\frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}\phi_1^{\frac{-n-2}{n-2}}L_g \phi_1 = \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)}\phi_1^{\frac{-4}{n-2}}\lambda_1.$$

After replacing g by $\phi_1^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g$, we assume the scalar curvature of the background metric g has a definite sign, that is, either

*Partially supported by GRF Grant 6041477

$$R_g > 0, \quad \text{or} \quad R_g \equiv 0, \quad \text{or} \quad R_g < 0.$$

Consider the functional

$$\mathcal{Q}(\phi) = \frac{\int_M |\nabla \phi|_g^2 + \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} R_g \phi^2 \, d\text{vol}_g}{\left(\int_M \phi^{\frac{2n}{n-2}} \, d\text{vol}_g \right)^{\frac{n-2}{n}}}.$$

u is a solution of the equation (1), then u is a critical point of the above functional $\mathcal{Q}$. It is a simple consequence of the Hölder inequality that

$$\lambda(M^n, g) := \inf_{\phi \in H^1(M) \setminus \{0\}} \mathcal{Q}(\phi) > -\infty.$$

In [24], Yamabe approached the problem by attempting to prove that a minimizing sequence of $\mathcal{Q}$ will converge to a minimizer. Trudinger ([22]) pointed out that the convergence failed on the standard sphere (S^n, g_{round}) , and Trudinger was able to fix Yamabe's arguments when $\lambda(M^n, g) \leq 0$. In general, we know

$$\lambda(M^n, g) \leq \lambda(S^n, g_{\text{round}}).$$

In ([1]), Aubin proved the convergence of the minimizing sequence if

$$\lambda(M^n, g) < \lambda(S^n, g_{\text{round}}).$$

When the manifold M^n is not locally conformally flat, it was proved by Aubin, for $n \geq 6$, and that by Schoen, for $n = 3, 4, 5$, that $\lambda(M^n, g) < \lambda(S^n, g_{\text{round}})$. When the manifold is locally conformally flat and not conformally diffeomorphic to the standard sphere, Schoen established the compactness result of the solutions to the equation (1) using a deep result of his joint work with Yau in [21], therefore confirmed the existence of the solutions.

For (M^n, g) , an n -dimensional ($n \geq 3$) smooth Riemannian compact manifold with boundary, a similar problem is to look for a metric $\tilde{g} \in [g]$ having constant scalar curvature on M^n and constant mean curvature on the boundary ∂M . Let $\tilde{g} = u^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$. The problem is equivalent to searching a solution of the following equation

$$\begin{cases} -L_g u &= c_1 u^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}} & \text{on } M^n \\ B_g u &= c_2 u^{\frac{n}{n-2}} & \text{on } \partial M, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where the boundary operator $B_g = \frac{2}{n-2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} + h_g$, h_g is the mean curvature of g w.r.t. the unit outer normal $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$, and c_1, c_2 denote two constants. When $c_2 = 0$, the

problem is variational. In fact, the equation (2) is the Euler-Lagrange equation of the functional

$$\mathcal{F}(\phi) = \frac{\int_M |\nabla \phi|_g^2 + \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} R_g \phi^2 \, dvol_g + \frac{n-2}{2} \int_{\partial M} h_g \phi^2 \, dS_g}{\left(\int_M \phi^{\frac{2n}{n-2}} \, dvol_g \right)^{\frac{n-2}{n}}},$$

and we have

$$\lambda(M, g) := \inf_{\phi \in H^1(M) \setminus \{0\}} \mathcal{F}(\phi) > -\infty.$$

Cherrier ([3]) proved that the $\inf \mathcal{F}$ is achieved by a smooth positive function if

$$\lambda(M, g) < \lambda(S_+^n, g_{ground}), \quad (3)$$

where (S_+^n, g_{ground}) is the standard half sphere. When $c_2 = 0$ in the equation (2), Escobar ([6]) obtained the existence of the solution for a large class of manifolds by achieving (3). For the general constant c_2 , let ϕ_1 be a smooth positive function of the eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} -L_g \phi_1 &= \lambda_1 \phi_1 & \text{on } M^n \\ B_g \phi_1 &= 0 & \text{on } \partial M, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\lambda_1 := \inf_{\phi \in H^1(M) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_M |\nabla \phi|_g^2 + \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} R_g \phi^2 \, dvol_g + \frac{n-2}{2} \int_{\partial M} h_g \phi^2 \, dS_g}{\int_M \phi^2 \, dvol_g}. \quad (4)$$

Then

$$\begin{cases} R_{\phi_1^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g} &= \frac{4(n-1)}{n-2} \lambda_1 \phi_1^{\frac{-4}{n-2}} & \text{on } M^n \\ h_{\phi_1^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g} &= 0 & \text{on } \partial M. \end{cases}$$

Replacing g by $\phi_1^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$, we may assume one of the following three cases holds, i.e.,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R_g > 0, & R_g < 0, & R_g = 0. \\ & \text{or} & \text{or} \\ h_g = 0 & h_g = 0 & h_g = 0 \end{array}$$

We say the equation (2) is of positive/negative/zero type if λ_1 as defined in (4) is positive/negative/zero respectively (see [12] for more discussion). When $c_2 = 0$, by the Hopf lemma, the positive/negative/zero type implies that $c_1 > 0/c_1 < 0/c_1 = 0$. In [7], Escobar proved that the equation (2) is solvable for some $c_2 > 0$ and some

$c_2 < 0$ under certain hypothesis. In [12], and [13], Han and Li confirmed the existence of the solutions to the equation (2) when the manifold is of positive type and is locally conformally flat with umbilic boundary or with non totally umbilic boundary of dimension $n \geq 5$. In this paper, we will study the equation (2) of negative type. More generally, we will study a fully nonlinear version of the negative type being stated as follows.

Let Ric_g denote the Ricci tensor of g . Consider the modified Schouten tensor of g as introduced in [18]

$$A_g^t := \frac{1}{n-2} \left(Ric_g - \frac{tR_g}{2(n-1)}g \right), \quad t \leq 1.$$

Note that $A_g^0 = Ric_g$ and $A_g^1 = A_g$ is the Schouten tensor (see [5]). Schouten tensor as a $(0, 2)$ tensor appears in the decomposition of the Riemann tensor, i.e., the Riemann tensor can be decomposed as the direct sum of the Weyl tensor and the Kulkarni-Numizu product of A_g with g . In [18], we introduced A_g^t up to a constant multiple. In fact, we introduced the tensor $sA_g + \frac{(1-s)R_g}{2(n-1)}g = sA_g^t$ with $t = n-1 - \frac{n-2}{s}$.

Assume that

$$\Gamma \subset R^n \quad \text{is an open convex symmetric cone with vertex at the origin} \quad (5)$$

satisfying

$$\Gamma_n := \{\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in R^n \mid \lambda_1 > 0, \dots, \lambda_n > 0\} \subset \Gamma \subset \Gamma_1 := \{\lambda \in R^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i > 0\}, \quad (6)$$

where Γ being symmetric means that

$$(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \Gamma \iff (\lambda_{i_1}, \dots, \lambda_{i_n}) \in \Gamma$$

for any permutation $(i_1, \dots, i_n)$ of $(1, \dots, n)$.

For $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$, assume that

$$f \in C^{2, \alpha_0}(\Gamma) \cap C^0(\bar{\Gamma}) \quad \text{is concave, homogeneous of degree 1 and symmetric in } \lambda_i, \quad (7)$$

satisfying

$$f|_{\partial\Gamma} = 0, \quad \nabla f \in \Gamma_n \quad \text{on } \Gamma, \quad (8)$$

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} f(s\lambda) = \infty, \quad \lambda \in \Gamma, \quad (9)$$

and

$$f(\lambda) \leq \frac{1}{\bar{\epsilon}} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i, \quad \sum_{i=1}^n f_{\lambda_i}(\lambda) \geq \bar{\epsilon} \quad \text{on the level set } \{f = 1\} \quad (10)$$

for some constant $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$.

Notice that f is homogeneous of degree 1. Therefore f_{λ_i} is homogeneous of degree 0 and the above assumption (10) also holds in Γ .

Let $\lambda_g(A_g^t)$ denote the eigenvalues of A_g^t w.r.t. the metric g . A fully nonlinear problem of negative admissible curvature is to look for a metric $\tilde{g} \in [g]$ solving

$$\begin{cases} f(-\lambda_{\tilde{g}}(A_{\tilde{g}}^t)) &= 1, & -\lambda_{\tilde{g}}(A_{\tilde{g}}^t) \in \Gamma & \text{on } M \\ h_{\tilde{g}} &= c & \text{on } \partial M, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

if $-\lambda_g(A_g^t) \in \Gamma$ on M and $h_g \leq 0$ on ∂M , where c is a constant.

When $(f, \Gamma) = (\sigma_k^{\frac{1}{k}}, \Gamma_k)$, the problem is the k -th Yamabe problem of negative admissible type, where

$$\sigma_k(\lambda) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq n} \lambda_{i_1} \cdots \lambda_{i_k}, \quad \Gamma_k := \{\lambda \in R^n \mid \sigma_1(\lambda) > 0, \dots, \sigma_k(\lambda) > 0\}.$$

It is well-known that $(\sigma_k^{\frac{1}{k}}, \Gamma_k)$ satisfies assumptions (5)-(10). In particular, when $k = 1$, the problem (11) is equivalent to solving the equation (2) of negative type. This is because $\sigma_1(-\lambda_{\tilde{g}}(A_{\tilde{g}}^t)) = -\frac{1}{n-2}(1 - \frac{nt}{2(n-1)})R_{\tilde{g}}$, and the assumption $-\lambda_g(A_g^t) \in \Gamma_1$, $h_g \leq 0$ is to say that $R_g < 0$ and $h_g \leq 0$, which implies that $\lambda_1 < 0$ by taking $\phi \equiv 1$ in (4). Conversely, if the equation is of negative type, we can assume $R_g < 0$ and $h_g = 0$. Clearly the solution u of the equation (2) also gives a solution $\tilde{g} = u^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g$ to the problem (11).

In [9], Gursky and Viaclovsky proved that, for $t < 1$, there exists a unique solution $\tilde{g} \in [g]$ solving

$$\sigma_k(-\lambda_{\tilde{g}}(A_{\tilde{g}}^t)) = 1, \quad -\lambda_{\tilde{g}}(A_{\tilde{g}}^t) \in \Gamma_k$$

if the compact manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$ has no boundary and $-\lambda_g(A_g^t) \in \Gamma_k$.

Theorem 1.1 *Let (M^n, g) be an n -dimensional ($n \geq 3$) compact smooth Riemannian manifold with $\partial M \neq \emptyset$, and let (f, Γ) be a pair satisfying (5)-(10). Assume that $-\lambda_g(A_g^t) \in \Gamma$ on M and $h_g \leq 0$ on ∂M . Then, for $c \leq 0$ and for $t < 1$, there exists a unique solution $\tilde{g} = e^{2v}g$ solving the problem (11). Moreover,*

$$\|v\|_{C^{4,\alpha_0}(M^n, g)} \leq C,$$

where $C > 0$ is a universal constant depending only on (M^n, g) , (f, Γ) , α , t , and $|c|$.

The next theorem is a more general result.

Theorem 1.2 *Let (M^n, g) be an n -dimensional ($n \geq 3$) compact smooth Riemannian manifold with $\partial M \neq \emptyset$, and let (f, Γ) be a pair satisfying (5)-(10). Assume that $-\lambda_g(A_g^t) \in \Gamma$ on M and $h_g \leq 0$ on ∂M . Given any $0 < \phi \in C^{2, \alpha_0}(M^n)$ and any $0 \geq \psi \in C^{3, \alpha_0}(\partial M)$, then, for $t < 1$, there exists a unique solution $\tilde{g} = e^{2v}g$ solving*

$$\begin{cases} f(-\lambda_{\tilde{g}}(A_{\tilde{g}}^t)) &= \phi, & -\lambda_{\tilde{g}}(A_{\tilde{g}}^t) \in \Gamma & \text{ on } M \\ h_{\tilde{g}} &= \psi & & \text{ on } \partial M. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Moreover

$$\|v\|_{C^{4, \alpha_0}(M^n, g)} \leq C,$$

where $C > 0$ is a universal constant depending only on (M^n, g) , (f, Γ) , ϕ , ψ , α , and t .

In the above theorems, we do not assume the boundary ∂M is umbilic or the manifold is locally conformally flat near ∂M , so when we establish the a-priori estimates on the boundary, we can not assume ∂M is totally geodesic, which offers a very useful geodesic normal coordinates, i.e., locally, one direction of the geodesic normal coordinates is the normal direction and all the other directions of coordinates are the tangent directions of ∂M . On the general manifolds, the lack of such coordinates causes the a-priori estimates much more difficult to obtain. The Yamabe problem of the negative case can avoid this particular assumption on the boundary of the manifold since the problem is variational and the minimizing sequence is convergent. However, our problem (12) may not even be variational. To overcome this difficulty, we introduce a very useful coordinates near ∂M in Section 4, called the tubular neighborhood normal coordinates. Such coordinates allow us get rid of the assumption of the umbilic boundary, which is very important in the following theorem. As an application of the above theorems, we affirm the existence of certain Riemannian metrics on a general compact smooth differential manifold with some boundary.

Theorem 1.3 *Let (f, Γ) , ϕ, ψ be as in Theorem 1.2. Any compact n -dimensional ($n \geq 3$) smooth differential manifold with some boundary always admits a smooth Riemannian metric $\tilde{g}$ with the negative Ricci tensor satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} \det(-\text{Ric}_{\tilde{g}}) = 1 & \text{ on } M, \\ h_{\tilde{g}} = 0 & \text{ on } \partial M. \end{cases}$$

More generally, for $t < 1$, any compact n -dimensional ($n \geq 3$) smooth differential manifold with some boundary always admits a C^{4, α_0} Riemannian metric $\tilde{g}$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} f(-\lambda_{\tilde{g}}(A_g^t)) &= \phi, & -\lambda_{\tilde{g}}(A_g^t) \in \Gamma & \text{ on } M \\ h_{\tilde{g}} &= \psi & & \text{ on } \partial M. \end{cases}$$

We want to point out that a similar problem of positive admissible curvature has been studied by quite a few people and many important results have been obtained such as [2], [10], [11], [14], [17], [18], [20] and the references therein. If we write the equation (1.3) in v with $\tilde{g} = e^{2v}g$. Then the equation becomes a fully nonlinear elliptic equation in v with the exact form being given in section 2. In general, fully nonlinear elliptic equations involving $f(\lambda(D^2v))$ have been studied by Caffarelli, Nirenberg and Spruck ([4]) and many others. Fully nonlinear equations involving $f(\lambda(\nabla_g^2 v + g))$ have been investigated by Li ([16]), Urbas ([23]) and others.

We organize our paper as follows. In section 2, we present some prerequisites and prove the uniqueness of the solution. We establish the C^0 estimates in section 3. In section 4, we introduce the tubular neighborhood normal coordinates and discuss some of its properties. In the next two sections, we use such coordinates to derive the gradient estimates and the Hessian estimates. In section 7, we establish the existence of the solution to the equation (12). In the last section, we prove the Theorem 1.3.

Acknowledgment: The first author would like to express her appreciation to Professor Yanyan Li for his valuable suggestions on possible topics to work on.

2 Uniqueness

For $\tilde{g} \in [g]$, write $\tilde{g} = e^{2v}g$. We have the conformal transformation

$$\begin{cases} A_{\tilde{g}}^t &= -W_g^v + e^{2v}A_g^t \\ h_{\tilde{g}} &= (h_g + v_\nu)e^{-v}, \end{cases}$$

where $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ is the unit outer normal of g on ∂M and

$$W_g^v := \nabla_g^2 v + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\Delta_g v)g + \frac{2-t}{2}|\nabla v|_g^2 g - dv \otimes dv.$$

The equation (12) is equivalent to solving

$$\begin{cases} f(\lambda_g(W_g^v - A_g^t)) &= \phi(x)e^{2v}, & \lambda_g(W_g^v - A_g^t) \in \Gamma & \text{ on } M \\ h_g + v_\nu &= e^v \psi(x) & & \text{ on } \partial M. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Proof of the Uniqueness. In this section, we give an independent proof of the uniqueness of the solution for $t \leq 1$ even though we can see this later from the method of continuity and a suitable homotopy for $t < 1$. Let v_1, v_2 be two solutions of the equation (13), and let $g_i = e^{2v_i}g$ for $i = 1, 2$. Write $g_2 = e^{2w}g_1$ with $w = v_2 - v_1$. Then v_2 is a solution of the equation (13) is to say

$$\begin{cases} f(\lambda_{g_1}(W_{g_1}^w - A_{g_1}^t)) &= \phi(x)e^{2w}, \quad \lambda_{g_1}(W_{g_1}^w - A_{g_1}^t) \in \Gamma \quad \text{on } M \\ h_{g_1} + w_{\nu_1} &= e^w \psi(x) \quad \text{on } \partial M, \end{cases}$$

where $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu_1}$ is the unit outer normal w.r.t. g_1 on ∂M .

Note that v_1 is also a solution of (13), so $h_{g_1} = \psi$ and the above equation becomes

$$\begin{cases} f(\lambda_{g_1}(W_{g_1}^w - A_{g_1}^t)) &= \phi(x)e^{2w}, \quad \lambda_{g_1}(W_{g_1}^w - A_{g_1}^t) \in \Gamma \quad \text{on } M \\ w_{\nu_1} &= (e^w - 1)\psi(x) \quad \text{on } \partial M. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Let $w(x_0) = \max_M w$.

Lemma 2.1 $w(x_0) \leq 0$.

Proof of the Lemma 2.1

Case 1. If x_0 is an interior point of M , then $\nabla_{g_1} w(x_0) = 0$, $\nabla_{g_1}^2 w(x_0) \leq 0$, and

$$W_{g_1}^w(x_0) = \nabla_{g_1}^2 w(x_0) + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\Delta_{g_1} w)(x_0)g_1(x_0) \leq 0,$$

which, together with (8), implies that

$$\phi(x_0)e^{2w(x_0)} = f(\lambda_{g_1}(W_{g_1}^w - A_{g_1}^t)(x_0)) \leq f(\lambda_{g_1}(-A_{g_1}^t)(x_0)) = \phi(x_0),$$

therefore $e^{2w(x_0)} \leq 1$, i.e., $w(x_0) \leq 0$.

Case 2. If $x_0 \in \partial M$, then $w_{\nu_1}(x_0) \geq 0$. By the second equation in (14), we know that

$$0 \leq w_{\nu_1}(x_0) = (e^w - 1)(x_0)\psi(x_0),$$

so either $(e^w - 1)(x_0) \leq 0$ when $\psi(x_0) < 0$, or $w_{\nu_1}(x_0) = 0$ when $\psi(x_0) = 0$, that is, when $\psi(x_0) < 0$, we have $w(x_0) \leq 0$, and when $\psi(x_0) = 0$, $w_{\nu_1}(x_0) = 0$ gives $\nabla_{g_1} w(x_0) = 0$, therefore $\nabla_{g_1}^2 w(x_0) \leq 0$. We can proceed as in case 1 to conclude that $w(x_0) \leq 0$. Lemma 2.1 has been established. ♣

Let $w(y_0) = \min_M w$.

Lemma 2.2 $w(y_0) \geq 0$.

Proof of the Lemma 2.2

Case 1. If y_0 is an interior point of M , then $\nabla_{g_1} w(y_0) = 0$, $\nabla_{g_1}^2 w(y_0) \geq 0$, and

$$W_{g_1}^w(y_0) = \nabla_{g_1}^2 w(y_0) + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\Delta_{g_1} w)(y_0)g_1(y_0) \geq 0,$$

which implies that

$$\phi(y_0)e^{2w(y_0)} = f(\lambda_{g_1}(W_{g_1}^w - A_{g_1}^t)(y_0)) \geq f(\lambda_{g_1}(-A_{g_1}^t)(y_0)) = \phi(y_0),$$

therefore $e^{2w(y_0)} \geq 1$, i.e., $w(y_0) \geq 0$.

Case 2. If $y_0 \in \partial M$, then $w_{\nu_1}(y_0) \leq 0$ and

$$0 \geq w_{\nu_1}(y_0) = (e^w - 1)(y_0)\psi(y_0),$$

so either $\psi(y_0) < 0$, we have $w(y_0) \geq 0$, or $\psi(y_0) = 0$, then $w_{\nu_1}(y_0) = 0$, which implies that $\nabla_{g_1} w(y_0) = 0$, therefore $\nabla_{g_1}^2 w(y_0) \geq 0$. We can proceed as in case 1 to conclude that $w(y_0) \geq 0$. Lemma 2.2 has been established. ♣

Combining Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, we have $w \equiv 0$, that is, $v_1 \equiv v_2$. The uniqueness of the solution of the equation (12) has been proved. ♣

Remark 2.1 When $k = 1$, $c = 0$, the uniqueness of the solution has been obtained by Cheerier in [3] and it implies that the solution must be the unique minimum point of $\mathcal{F}$.

3 C^0 estimates

When the manifold has some boundary, the C^0 estimate is not a trivial consequence of the maximum principle anymore. In this section, we obtain C^0 estimates by establishing the upper bounds and the lower bounds individually.

Lemma 3.1 *Let (M^n, g) and (f, Γ) be as in Theorem 1.2. For $t \leq 1$, let v be a C^2 solution of the equation (12). Then there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ depending only on (M^n, g, t) , (f, Γ) , ϕ and ψ such that*

$$v \leq C.$$

Proof of the Lemma 3.1. In this paper, if not specified, we will use $C > 0$ to denote a universal constant with the dependence as being described in the statement

of the Lemma 3.1, but may change from line to line. Since $\lambda_g(A_g^t) \in \Gamma \subset \Gamma_1$ and $h_g \leq 0$, we have $R_g < 0$ and $h_g \leq 0$, from which, we know that (M^n, g) is of negative type. Hence we can find $g_0 = e^{2v_0}g$ such that

$$\begin{cases} R_{g_0} < 0 & \text{on } M \\ h_{g_0} = 0 & \text{on } \partial M. \end{cases}$$

Write $e^{2v}g = e^{2\tilde{v}}g_0$ with $\tilde{v} = v - v_0$. Then $\tilde{v}$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} f(\lambda_{g_0}(W_{g_0}^{\tilde{v}} - A_{g_0}^t)) &= \phi(x)e^{2\tilde{v}}, \quad \lambda_{g_0}(W_{g_0}^{\tilde{v}} - A_{g_0}^t) \in \Gamma & \text{on } M \\ \tilde{v}_{\nu_0} &= e^{\tilde{v}}\psi(x) & \text{on } \partial M, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu_0}$ is the unit outer normal of g_0 on ∂M .

Let $\tilde{v}(x_0) = \max_M(\tilde{v})$.

Case 1. If x_0 is an interior point of M , then $\nabla_{g_0}\tilde{v}(x_0) = 0$, $\nabla_{g_0}^2\tilde{v}(x_0) \leq 0$ and therefore $W_{g_0}^{\tilde{v}}(x_0) \leq 0$. Hence

$$\lambda_{g_0}(W_{g_0}^{\tilde{v}} - A_{g_0}^t)(x_0) \in \Gamma$$

implies that $\lambda_{g_0}(-A_{g_0}^t) \in \Gamma$. Thus by (9) and (10),

$$\begin{aligned} e^{2\tilde{v}(x_0)}\phi(x_0) &= f(\lambda_{g_0}(W_{g_0}^{\tilde{v}} - A_{g_0}^t)(x_0)) \leq f(\lambda_{g_0}(-A_{g_0}^t)(x_0)) \\ &\leq C\sigma_1(\lambda_{g_0}(-A_{g_0}^t)(x_0)) \leq C\max_M(-R_g) =: C, \end{aligned}$$

so we have $\tilde{v}(x_0) \leq C$.

Case 2. If $x_0 \in \partial M$, then $\psi(x_0) = 0$. If not, then at x_0 , the second equation in (15) implies that

$$0 \leq \tilde{v}_{\nu_0}(x_0) = e^{\tilde{v}}(x_0)\psi(x_0) < 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Thus $\tilde{v}_{\nu_0}(x_0) = e^{\tilde{v}}(x_0)\psi(x_0) = 0$, $\nabla_{g_0}\tilde{v}(x_0) = 0$, and $\nabla_{g_0}^2\tilde{v}(x_0) \leq 0$. We can proceed as in case 1 to obtain $v(x_0) \leq C$.

Combining the above two cases, we have $\tilde{v} \leq C$, which means $v \leq C$. Lemma 3.1 has been established. ♣

Lemma 3.2 *Let (M^n, g) and (f, Γ) be as in Theorem 1.2. For $t \leq 1$, let v be a C^2 solution of the equation (12). Then there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ depending only on (M^n, g, t) , (f, Γ) , ϕ and ψ such that*

$$v \geq -C.$$

Proof of the Lemma 3.2. Let $\bar{w}$ be a smooth function such that $\bar{w}$ is the distance function to ∂M near the boundary and $\bar{w}$ takes value in $[0, 1]$ in general. Then $\bar{w}_\nu|_{\partial M} \equiv -1$. Let $g_0 = e^{2\epsilon_0 \bar{w}} g$ with $\epsilon_0 > 0$ being a constant to be chosen later. We have

$$h_{g_0} = (h_g + \epsilon_0 \bar{w}_\nu) e^{-\epsilon_0 \bar{w}} \leq -\epsilon_0 e^{-\epsilon_0} < 0, \quad (16)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} -\lambda_{g_0}(A_{g_0}^t) &= \lambda_g \left(\epsilon_0 [\nabla_g^2 \bar{w} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g \bar{w}) g \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{2-t}{2} \epsilon_0 |\nabla \bar{w}|_g^2 g - \epsilon_0 d\bar{w} \otimes d\bar{w}] - A_g^t \right), \end{aligned}$$

so we can take $\epsilon_0 \ll 1$ depending only on (M^n, g, t, f, Γ) such that

$$-\lambda_{g_0}(A_{g_0}^t) \in \Gamma \quad \text{and} \quad f(-\lambda_{g_0}(A_{g_0}^t)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \min_M f(-\lambda_g(A_g^t)). \quad (17)$$

Let $\tilde{v} = v - \epsilon_0 \bar{w}$. Then $e^{2v} g = e^{2\tilde{v}} g_0$ and $\tilde{v}$ solves

$$\begin{cases} f(\lambda_{g_0}(W_{g_0}^{\tilde{v}} - A_{g_0}^t)) &= \phi(x) e^{2\tilde{v}}, \quad \lambda_{g_0}(W_{g_0}^{\tilde{v}} - A_{g_0}^t) \in \Gamma \quad \text{on } M \\ \tilde{v}_{\nu_0} + h_{g_0} &= e^{\tilde{v}} \psi(x) \quad \text{on } \partial M, \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Let $\tilde{v}(y_0) = \min_M \tilde{v}$.

Case 1. If y_0 is in the interior of M , then $\nabla_{g_0} \tilde{v}(y_0) = 0$, $\nabla_{g_0}^2 \tilde{v}(y_0) \geq 0$ and $W_{g_0}^{\tilde{v}}(y_0) \geq 0$. Hence by (9), (17) and (18),

$$\begin{aligned} e^{2\tilde{v}(y_0)} \phi(y_0) &= f(\lambda_{g_0}(W_{g_0}^{\tilde{v}} - A_{g_0}^t)(y_0)) \geq f(\lambda_{g_0}(-A_{g_0}^t)(y_0)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \min_M f(\lambda_g(-A_g^t)), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\tilde{v}(y_0) \geq \frac{1}{2} \min_M (\ln(\frac{1}{2\phi} \min_M f(\lambda_g(-A_g^t)))) \geq -C.$$

Case 2. If $y_0 \in \partial M$, then $\tilde{v}_{\nu_0}(y_0) \leq 0$. By (16) and (18),

$$-\epsilon_0 e^{-\epsilon_0} \geq h_{g_0}(y_0) + \tilde{v}_{\nu_0}(y_0) = e^{\tilde{v}(y_0)} \psi(y_0) \geq -C e^{\tilde{v}(y_0)},$$

so

$$\tilde{v}(y_0) \geq \ln \frac{\epsilon_0}{C} - \epsilon_0 \geq -C.$$

Combining the above two cases, we know $\tilde{v} \geq -C$, hence $v \geq -C$. Lemma 3.2 has been proved. ♣

4 Tubular Neighborhood Normal Coordinates

The main issue of the gradient and the Hessian estimates is the bounds on the boundary of M . For this reason, we need to introduce certain coordinates near ∂M . Let $g|_{\partial M}$ be the induced metric of g on ∂M , and let $\delta_1 > 0$ be the minimum of the injectivity radius of (M^n, g) and the injectivity radius of $(\partial M, g|_{\partial M})$. Consider the map $E : \partial M \times [0, \delta_1) \rightarrow M$ by $E(y, t) = \exp_y(-t \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu})$. Since $E(y, 0) = y$ implies that, for any $y \in \partial M$, $dE|_{(y,0)}(X) = X$ for $X \in T_y(\partial M)$, and $dE|_{(y,0)}(\frac{d}{dt}) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \neq 0$. That is, $dE|_{(y,0)}$ is an isomorphism from $T_{(y,0)}(\partial M \times [0, \delta_1)) \rightarrow T_y M$. By the Implicit Function Theorem, there exists some constant $\delta_y \in (0, \delta_1)$ such that E is a smooth diffeomorphism on $(\partial M \cap B_{\delta_y}(y)) \times [0, \delta_y)$, where $B_{\delta_y}(y)$ is the open geodesic ball of (M^n, g) centered at y with radius δ_y . By shrinking $B_{\delta_y}(y)$, we can also assume the exponential map of $(\partial M, g|_{\partial M})$ at y is a smooth diffeomorphism in $B_{\delta_y}(y) \cap \partial M$. Now we extend $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ to the interior of M , still denoted by $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ such that $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}|_{E(z,t)} = -\frac{dE}{dt}|_{(z,t)}$ for any $z \in \partial M \cap B_{\delta_y}(y)$. Then $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ is a smooth unit vector field in $E((\partial M \cap B_{\delta_y}(y)) \times [0, \delta_y))$.

Proposition 4.1 *For any $y_0 \in \partial M$,*

$$B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{2}}(y_0) \subset E((\partial M \cap B_{\delta_{y_0}}(y_0)) \times [0, \delta_{y_0})),$$

and for any $y \in B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{2}}(y_0)$, there exists a unique $\bar{y} \in \partial M$ such that $d(y, \bar{y}) = d(y, \partial M)$. Moreover $\bar{y} \in B_{\delta_{y_0}}(y_0) \cap \partial M$.

Proof of the Proposition 4.1 For any $y \in B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{2}}(y_0)$,

$$s := d(y, \partial M) \leq d(y, y_0) < \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{2}.$$

For any $z \in \partial M \setminus B_{\delta_{y_0}}(y_0)$,

$$d(y, z) \geq d(z, y_0) - d(y, y_0) > \delta_{y_0} - \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{2} = \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{2}.$$

Thus if $d(y, \partial M) = d(y, \bar{y})$ for some $\bar{y} \in \partial M$, then $\bar{y} \in \partial M \cap B_{\delta_{y_0}}(y_0)$. Let $r(t)$ be the normalized geodesic connecting y and $\bar{y}$ such that $r(0) = \bar{y}$ and $r(s) = y$. Then $\frac{dr}{dt}|_{t=0} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}|_{\bar{y}}$, that is $y = E(\bar{y}, s)$. Therefore $y \in E((\partial M \cap B_{\delta_{y_0}}(y_0)) \times [0, \delta_{y_0}))$, and $B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{2}}(y_0) \subset E((\partial M \cap B_{\delta_{y_0}}(y_0)) \times [0, \delta_{y_0}))$. Recall E is a smooth diffeomorphism in $(\partial M \cap B_{\delta_{y_0}}(y_0)) \times [0, \delta_{y_0})$ and $\bar{y} \in \partial M \cap B_{\delta_{y_0}}(y_0)$. Thus $\bar{y}$ is uniquely determined by y . The Proposition 4.1 has been proved. ♣

By the Proposition 4.1, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} = -\frac{dE}{dt}$ is a smooth unit vector field in $B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{2}}(y_0)$. Moreover, in $B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{2}}(y_0)$, the parameter t in $E(y, t)$ is the distance parameter to the boundary of M , which can be derived more precisely as in establishing (19). Let $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^{n-1}$ be the geodesic normal coordinates w.r.t. the metric $g|_{\partial M}$ at y_0 . Then $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^{n-1}$ is smooth and well-defined in $\partial M \cap B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{2}}(y_0)$. For any $y \in B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{2}}(y_0)$, there is a unique $\bar{y} \in \partial M$ such that $d(y, \bar{y}) = d(y, \partial M)$. By the Proposition 4.1, $\bar{y} \in \partial M \cap B_{\delta_{y_0}}(y_0)$. Let $(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1})$ be the geodesic normal coordinates of $\bar{y}$ w.r.t. the metric $g|_{\partial M}$ at y_0 . Define $(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}, y_n)$ as the coordinates of y with $y_n = d(y, \partial M)$. Such coordinates are well-defined and smooth in $B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{2}}(y_0)$. The reason is that $\bar{y}$ is uniquely determined and $\bar{y} \in \partial M \cap B_{\delta_{y_0}}(y_0)$, which implies that $y = E(\bar{y}, y_n)$. Hence the map from y to $(\bar{y}, y_n)$ is the inverse of the smooth diffeomorphism E , therefore is also a smooth diffeomorphism, that is to say $(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is well-defined and smooth in $B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{2}}(y_0)$. We call such coordinates the tubular neighborhood normal coordinates of y at y_0 . Observe that $g(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}) = \delta_{ij}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$ at y_0 . Moreover, such coordinates has the following proposition.

Proposition 4.2 For $1 \leq j \leq n-1$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y_n} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}, \quad g\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}\right) = 0, \quad \text{in } B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8}}(y_0).$$

Proof of the Proposition 4.2 For any $y \in B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8}}(y_0)$ with $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ as its tubular neighborhood normal coordinates at y_0 . Let $\bar{y} \in \partial M \cap B_{\delta_{y_0}}(y_0)$ be the unique point such that $d(y, \bar{y}) = a_n < \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8}$. Clearly $\bar{y} \in B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{4}}(y_0)$ since

$$d(y, z) \geq d(z, y_0) - d(y, y_0) > \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{4} - \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8} = \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8} \quad \text{for any } z \in \partial M \setminus B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{4}}(y_0).$$

Let $r(t) = E(\bar{y}, t)$. Then r is smooth and well-defined for $t \in [0, \delta_{y_0})$. For $t \in [0, \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8})$, by

$$d(r(t), y_0) \leq d(r(t), \bar{y}) + d(\bar{y}, y_0) < \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8} + \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{4} < \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{2},$$

there exists a unique $\tilde{y} \in \partial M$ such that

$$d(r(t), \tilde{y}) = d(r(t), \partial M) =: d^t \leq d(r(t), \bar{y}) \leq t.$$

By the Proposition 4.1, $\tilde{y} \in B_{\delta_{y_0}}(y_0) \cap \partial M$ and $E(\tilde{y}, d^t) = r(t) = E(\bar{y}, t)$. Therefore $\tilde{y} = \bar{y}$ and $d^t = t$ since E is a smooth diffeomorphism on $(\partial M \cap B_{\delta_{y_0}}(y_0)) \times [0, \delta_{y_0})$. From which, we know that $(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, t)$ is the tubular neighborhood normal coordinates of $r(t)$ at y_0 for $t \in [0, \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8})$. Hence, for $t \in [0, \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8})$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}|_{r(t)} = \frac{dr}{dt}|_t = \frac{dE}{dt}|_{(\bar{y}, t)} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}|_{E(\bar{y}, t)} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}|_{r(t)}.$$

In particular,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}|_y = \frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}|_{r(a_n)} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}|_{r(a_n)} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}|_y.$$

To prove the second statement in the proposition, we consider the set

$$\mathcal{S} := \{z \in B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8}}(y_0) \mid d(z, \partial M) = a_n\}.$$

Clearly, $y \in \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$. For any $z \in \mathcal{S}$, let $r(t) = E(\bar{z}, t)$ for some $\bar{z} \in B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{4}}(y_0) \cap \partial M$ such that $r(0) = \bar{z}$ and $r(a_n) = z$. As derived earlier, $d(r(t), \partial M) = t$ for any $t \in [0, \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8})$, which implies that $r([0, \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8}))$ intersects $\mathcal{S}$ at a single point $z = r(a_n)$. Moreover, we claim that

$$d(r(t), \mathcal{S}) = t - a_n, \quad \forall t \in [a_n, \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8}). \quad (19)$$

Notice that, for $t \in [a_n, \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8})$, $d(r(t), \mathcal{S}) \leq d(r(t), r(a_n)) \leq t - a_n$. If (19) does not hold, then $d(r(t), \mathcal{S}) < t - a_n$, which implies that there exists some $\tilde{z} \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $d(r(t), \tilde{z}) < t - a_n$. Therefore

$$t = d(r(t), \partial M) \leq d(r(t), \tilde{z}) + d(\tilde{z}, \partial M) < t - a_n + a_n = t,$$

which is a contradiction. Next, we claim

$$d(r(t), \mathcal{S}) = a_n - t, \quad \forall t \in [0, a_n). \quad (20)$$

If not, then $d(r(t), \mathcal{S}) < a_n - t$ since $d(r(t), \mathcal{S}) \leq d(r(t), r(a_n)) \leq a_n - t$, so there exists some $\hat{z} \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $d(r(t), \hat{z}) < a_n - t$, which implies that

$$a_n = d(\hat{z}, \partial M) \leq d(r(t), \hat{z}) + d(r(t), \partial M) < a_n - t + t = a_n,$$

which is a contradiction.

By (19) and (20), we know $r(a_n)$ is a point in $\mathcal{S}$ such that $d(r(a_n), r(t)) = d(r(t), \mathcal{S})$ for $t \in [0, \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8})$, and r is the normalized geodesic connecting $r(t)$ and $r(a_n)$, so $\frac{dr}{dt}|_{a_n} = \frac{dE}{dt}|_{(\bar{z}, a_n)}$ is the unit normal vector of $\mathcal{S}$ at $r(a_n) = z$, i.e., $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_n} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} = \frac{dE}{dt}$ is the unit normal vector of $\mathcal{S}$ at $r(a_n) = z$. Let $(b_1, \dots, b_{n-1}, a_n)$ be the tubular neighborhood normal coordinates of z at y_0 . Observe that, for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, since z is an interior point of $B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8}}(y_0)$, the curve

$$\{(y_1, \dots, y_k, \dots, y_n) = (b_1, \dots, b_{k-1}, y_k, b_{k+1}, \dots, a_n)\} \quad \text{for } y_k \text{ near } b_k$$

is contained in $\mathcal{S}$, which implies that $\{\frac{\partial}{\partial y_k}|_z\} \in T_z \mathcal{S}$. Hence $g(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}) = 0$ at z for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ since $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_n} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ is the normal vector of $\mathcal{S}$ at z . $z \in \mathcal{S}$ is arbitrary and $y \in \mathcal{S}$, so, at y , we also have

$$g(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}) = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq n-1.$$

The Proposition 4.2 has been proved. ♣

As a simple consequence, we have $g(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}) = \delta_{ij}$ at y_0 for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.

Proposition 4.3

$$\{(y_1, \dots, y_n) \mid \sqrt{y_1^2 + \dots + y_n^2} < \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{16}, \quad y_n \geq 0\} \subset B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8}}(y_0),$$

where $(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is the tubular neighborhood normal coordinates at y_0 .

Proof of the Proposition 4.3 For any $(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ with $\sqrt{y_1^2 + \dots + y_n^2} < \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{16}$ and $y_n \geq 0$, there exists a unique $\bar{y} \in B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{16}}(y_0)$ such that $(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1})$ is the geodesic normal coordinates of $\bar{y}$ w.r.t. the metric $g|_{\partial M}$ at y_0 . Consider $r(t) = E(\bar{y}, t)$. Then $r(t)$ is smooth for $t \in [0, \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{16})$ and $r([0, \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{16})) \subset B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8}}(y_0)$. Moreover $d(r(t), \partial M) = t$ for $t \in [0, \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{16})$ as shown earlier. In particular, by $y_n < \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{16}$, $y = E(\bar{y}, y_n)$ has $(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ as its tubular neighborhood normal coordinates at y_0 . The Proposition 4.3 has been proved. ♣

Denote $B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{16}}^T(y_0) := \{(y_1, \dots, y_n) \mid \sqrt{y_1^2 + \dots + y_n^2} < \frac{\delta_{y_0}}{16}, \quad y_n \geq 0\}$, which is different from the geodesic ball $B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{16}}(y_0)$. The Proposition 4.3 says that $B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{16}}^T(y_0) \subset B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{8}}(y_0)$. Since $\cup_{y_0 \in \partial M} B_{\frac{\delta_{y_0}}{64}}^T(y_0) = \partial M$ and ∂M is compact, we can find $\{y^i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \partial M$ such that $\cup_{i=1}^N (B_{\frac{\delta_{y^i}}{64}}^T(y^i) \cap \partial M) = \partial M$.

5 Gradient estimates

Lemma 5.1 *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.2, for $t < 1$, let v be a C^3 solution of the equation (12). Then there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ depending only on (M^n, g, t) , (f, Γ) , ϕ , and ψ , such that*

$$|\nabla v|_g \leq C \quad \text{on } \partial M.$$

Proof of the Lemma 5.1. Extend h_g to a smooth function on M , and ψ to a C^{3,α_0} function on M . More explanation is given in section 7. We still denote the extended functions by ψ, h_g respectively. For each $1 \leq i_0 \leq N$, Let $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^n$ be the tubular neighborhood normal coordinates at y^{i_0} . Let $\rho = \rho(y_1^2 + \cdots + y_n^2)$ be a smooth cut-off function satisfying

$$\rho(y) = \begin{cases} 1 & , \quad \text{if } y \in \overline{B_{\delta_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{32}}}^T(y^{i_0})} \\ \in [0, 1] & , \quad \text{if } y \in B_{\delta_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}}^T(y^{i_0}) \setminus B_{\delta_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{32}}}^T(y^{i_0}) \\ 0 & , \quad \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and let $\beta(y)$ be a smooth function in $B_{\delta_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}}^T(y^{i_0})$ satisfying

$$\beta(y) = \begin{cases} y_n, & \text{if } y_n < \delta_0, \\ \in [0, 2\delta_0], & \text{o.w.,} \end{cases}$$

where $0 < \delta_0 < \frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{32}$ is a very small constant such that $1 + 2\delta_0\psi e^v > \frac{1}{2}$ on M and to be chosen later. Then in $B_{\delta_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}}^T(y^{i_0}) \cap \partial M$,

$$\beta \equiv 0, \quad \beta_\nu \equiv -1. \quad (21)$$

Let

$$\gamma := (\psi e^v - h_g)\beta,$$

In the following, we use subindices to denote the covariant derivatives w.r.t. $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}$, e.g.,

$$(v + \gamma)_k = \left(\nabla(v + \gamma) \right) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_k} \right), \quad (v + \gamma)_{k\nu} = \left(\nabla^2(v + \gamma) \right) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \right).$$

Consider

$$G := \rho \sum_k (v + \gamma)_k^2 \alpha\left(\frac{v + \gamma + L}{L^2}\right),$$

where $L > 0$ is a constant satisfying $1 < v + \gamma + L < 2L$ and $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a smooth positive function to be chosen later.

Notice that $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}$ in $B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}^T(y^{i_0})$ and

$$B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}^T(y^{i_0}) \cap \partial M = \{y \in B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}^T(y^{i_0}) \mid y_n = 0 \text{ and } \sqrt{y_1^2 + \cdots + y_{n-1}^2} < \frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{16}\}.$$

Hence in $B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}^T(y^{i_0}) \cap \partial M$,

$$\rho_\nu = -\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial y_n} \Big|_{y_n=0} = 0. \quad (22)$$

Claim 5.1 In $B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}^T(y^{i_0}) \cap \partial M$, $G_\nu \equiv 0$.

Proof of the Claim 5.1. In $B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}^T(y^{i_0}) \cap \partial M$, by (21) and the second equation in (12),

$$\begin{aligned} (v + \gamma)_\nu &= v_\nu + ((\psi e^v - h_g)\beta)_\nu = (\psi e^v - h_g) + (\psi e^v - h_g)_\nu \beta + (\psi e^v - h_g)\beta_\nu \\ &= (\psi e^v - h_g) - (\psi e^v - h_g) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Therefore in $B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}^T(y^{i_0}) \cap \partial M$,

$$(v + \gamma)_{k,\nu} = -(v + \gamma)_{k,n} = -(v + \gamma)_{n,k} = (v + \gamma)_{\nu,k} = 0, \quad \forall \quad 1 \leq k \leq n-1, \quad (24)$$

where in the last equality, we used the fact that $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_k}$ is a tangent vector field of $B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}^T(y^{i_0}) \cap \partial M$.

In $B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}^T(y^{i_0}) \cap \partial M$, by (22) and (23),

$$\begin{aligned} G_\nu &= 2\rho\alpha\left(\frac{v+\gamma+L}{L^2}\right) \sum_{k=1}^n (v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_{k,\nu} \\ &= 2\rho\alpha\left(\frac{v+\gamma+L}{L^2}\right) (v + \gamma)_n (v + \gamma)_{n,\nu} \quad \text{by (24)} \\ &= 2\rho\alpha\left(\frac{v+\gamma+L}{L^2}\right) (v + \gamma)_\nu (v + \gamma)_{\nu,\nu} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Claim 5.1 has been proved. ♣.

Let $G(x_0) = \frac{\max}{B_{\frac{\delta}{16}}^T(y^{i_0})} G$ for some $x_0 \in B_{\frac{\delta}{16}}^T(y^{i_0})$. W.l.o.g., $G(x_0) \geq 1$. By the

Claim 5.1, we have

$$\nabla G(x_0) = 0, \quad \nabla^2 G(x_0) \leq 0.$$

In $B_{\frac{\delta}{16}}^T(y^{i_0})$

$$\begin{aligned} G_i &= \rho_i \alpha \sum_k (v + \gamma)_k^2 + 2\rho \alpha (v + \gamma)_{k,i} (v + \gamma)_k + \frac{\rho \alpha'}{L^2} (v + \gamma)_i \sum_k (v + \gamma)_k^2 \\ &= 2\rho \alpha (v + \gamma)_{k,i} (v + \gamma)_k + \left(\frac{\rho_i}{\rho} + \frac{\alpha'}{L^2 \alpha} (v + \gamma)_i \right) G, \end{aligned}$$

so at x_0 ,

$$(v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_{k,i} = -\frac{\alpha'}{2L^2 \alpha} \sum_k (v + \gamma)_k^2 (v + \gamma)_i - \frac{\rho_i}{2\rho} \sum_k (v + \gamma)_k^2, \quad (25)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} G_{ij}(x_0) &= 2\rho \alpha (v + \gamma)_{k,i} (v + \gamma)_{k,j} + 2\rho \alpha (v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_{k,ij} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\alpha(\rho \rho_{ij} - 2\rho_i \rho_j)}{\rho} + \frac{\rho(\alpha \alpha'' - 2(\alpha')^2)}{L^4 \alpha} \right) (v + \gamma)_i (v + \gamma)_j + \frac{\alpha' \rho}{L^2} (v + \gamma)_{ij} \\ &\quad - \frac{\alpha'}{L^2} (\rho_j (v + \gamma)_i + \rho_i (v + \gamma)_j) \sum_k (v + \gamma)_k^2 \end{aligned}$$

Let $F(\bar{A}) = f(\lambda(\bar{A}))$ for any symmetric matrix $\bar{A}$ with $\lambda(\bar{A}) \in \Gamma$. Let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be an orthonormal basis of $T_x M$. Denote $\bar{W} := W_g^v - A_g^t$. Let $\bar{W}(e_i, e_j) = \bar{w}_{ij}$ and let $F^{ij} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial \bar{w}_{ij}}$. (8) implies $(F^{ij}) > 0$. Denote $\bar{L}^{ij} := F^{ir} g^{rj} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} \left(\sum_{l=1}^n F^{ll} \right) g^{ij}$. At x_0 , assume $e_i = a_i^j \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}$. Then $g(e_i, e_j) = \delta_{ij}$ is to say that $A^T A = \mathcal{G}^{-1}$, where $A = (a_i^j)$, $\mathcal{G}^{-1} = (g_{ij})^{-1}$, and $g_{ij} = g(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j})$. Denote $B = (F^{ij})$ and $D = (G_{ij})$. By $(\nabla^2 G(e_i, e_j)) \leq 0$, we have $\sum_i \nabla^2 G(e_i, e_i) = g^{ij} G_{ij}(x_0) \leq 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq F^{ij} \nabla^2 G(e_i, e_j)(x_0) = F^{ij} a_i^r a_j^s G_{rs} = \text{tr}(B A^T D A) = \text{tr}(B A^T A D) \\ &= \text{tr}(B \mathcal{G}^{-1} D) = F^{ir} g^{rj} G_{ij}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., we have $\bar{L}^{ij} G_{ij}(x_0) \leq 0$.

In the following, we use $C_1 > 0$ to denote a universal constant depending only on (M^n, g, t) , ϕ , ψ , $\delta_{y^{i_0}}$, L , α , and we use $C_2 > 0$ to denote a universal constant depending only on (M^n, g, t) , ϕ , ψ , $\delta_{y^{i_0}}$, L , δ_0 , α , β . We also use $O_1(1)$ to denote a quantity bounded by C_1 , and $O_2(1)$ to denote a quantity bounded by C_2 . Observe that $\frac{1}{C_1}(\delta^{ij}) \leq \mathcal{G}^{-1} \leq C_1(\delta^{ij})$ in $B_{\frac{\delta}{16}}^T(y^{i_0})$. We will use this fact without mentioning.

At x_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \bar{L}^{ij}G_{ij} = 2\rho\alpha\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_{k,i}(v+\gamma)_{k,j} + 2\rho\alpha\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_k(v+\gamma)_{k,ij} \\
&\quad + \bar{L}^{ij}\left(\frac{\alpha(\rho\rho_{ij}-2\rho_i\rho_j)}{\rho} + \frac{\rho(\alpha\alpha''-2(\alpha')^2)}{L^4\alpha}\right)(v+\gamma)_i(v+\gamma)_j \\
&\quad + \frac{\alpha'\rho}{L^2}(v+\gamma)_{ij} - \frac{\alpha'}{L^2}(\rho_j(v+\gamma)_i + \rho_i(v+\gamma)_j)\sum_k(v+\gamma)_k^2 \\
&\geq 2\rho\alpha\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_{k,i}(v+\gamma)_{k,j} + 2\rho\alpha\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_k(v+\gamma)_{k,ij} \\
&\quad + \frac{\rho(\alpha\alpha''-2(\alpha')^2)}{L^4\alpha}\sum_k(v+\gamma)_k^2\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_i(v+\gamma)_j \\
&\quad + \frac{\alpha'\rho}{L^2}\sum_k(v+\gamma)_k^2\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_{ij} - C_1\sqrt{\rho}\sum_{k,l}F^{ll}|(v+\gamma)_k|^3 - C_1\sum_{k,l}F^{ll}(v+\gamma)_k^2 \\
&\geq 2\rho\alpha\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_{k,i}(v+\gamma)_{k,j} + 2\rho\alpha\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_k(v+\gamma)_{k,ij} \\
&\quad + \frac{\rho(\alpha\alpha''-2(\alpha')^2)}{L^4\alpha}\sum_k(v+\gamma)_k^2\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_i(v+\gamma)_j \\
&\quad + \frac{\alpha'\rho}{L^2}\sum_k(v+\gamma)_k^2\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_{ij} - C_1\sqrt{\rho}\sum_{k,l}F^{ll}|(v+\gamma)_k|^3,
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where in the last inequality, we used $G(x_0) \geq 1$, therefore $\sqrt{\rho}\sum_k|(v+\gamma)_k| \geq \frac{1}{C_1}$.

In general,

$$\begin{aligned}
(v+\gamma)_{ij,k} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial y_k}\left((v+\gamma)_{i,j} - \Gamma_{ji}^l(v+\gamma)_l\right) \\
&= (v+\gamma)_{i,j,k} - \Gamma_{ji}^l(v+\gamma)_{l,k} - \frac{\partial\Gamma_{ji}^l}{\partial y_k}(v+\gamma)_l,
\end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}
(v+\gamma)_{k,ij} &= (\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}}\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}} - \Gamma_{ji}^l\frac{\partial}{\partial y_l})(v+\gamma)_k \\
&= (v+\gamma)_{k,i,j} - \Gamma_{ji}^l(v+\gamma)_{k,l} \\
&= (v+\gamma)_{ij,k} + \frac{\partial\Gamma_{ji}^l}{\partial y_k}(v+\gamma)_l,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \bar{L}^{ij}G_{ij}(x_0) \\
&\geq 2\rho\alpha\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_{k,i}(v+\gamma)_{k,j} + 2\rho\alpha\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_k(v+\gamma)_{k,ij} \\
&\quad + \frac{\rho(\alpha\alpha''-2(\alpha')^2)}{L^4\alpha}\sum_k(v+\gamma)_k^2\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_i(v+\gamma)_j \\
&\quad + \frac{\alpha'\rho}{L^2}\sum_k(v+\gamma)_k^2\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_{ij} - C_1\sqrt{\rho}\sum_{k,l}F^{ll}|(v+\gamma)_k|^3.
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Recall that $\gamma = (\psi e^v - h_g)\beta$. At x_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
(v+\gamma)_k &= (1+\psi\beta e^v)v_k + e^v\beta\psi_k + \psi e^v\beta_k - (h_g\beta)_k \\
&= av_k + O_2(1) \quad \text{with } a := 1 + \psi\beta e^v.
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

$$\sum_k(v+\gamma)_k^2 = a^2\sum_k v_k^2 + O_2(1)\sum_k |v_k|. \tag{29}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(v + \gamma)_{ij} &= av_{ij} + e^v \beta (v_i \psi_j + \psi_i v_j) + e^v \psi (v_i \beta_j + v_j \beta_i) + e^v (\psi_i \beta_j + \psi_j \beta_i) \\
&\quad + e^v \psi \beta v_i v_j + e^v \beta \psi_{ij} + e^v \psi \beta_{ij} - (h_g \beta)_{ij} \\
&= av_{ij} + O_2(1) \sum_k |v_k| + O_1(1) \beta \sum_k v_k^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

The above identity (30) also holds for $(v + \gamma)_{i,j}$ after a slight modification, i.e., we only need to change $v_{ij}, \psi_{ij}, \beta_{ij}, (h_g \beta)_{ij}$ to $v_{i,j}, \psi_{i,j}, \beta_{i,j}, (h_g \beta)_{i,j}$ respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}
(v + \gamma)_{ij,k} &= av_{ij,k} + e^v (\psi_k \beta + \psi \beta_k) v_{ij} + e^v \psi \beta v_k v_{ij} + e^v \psi \beta (v_j v_{i,k} + v_i v_{j,k}) \\
&\quad + (e^v (\psi \beta_j + \psi_j \beta) v_{i,k} + e^v (\psi \beta_i + \psi_i \beta) v_{j,k}) + e^v \psi \beta v_i v_j v_k \\
&\quad + e^v (\psi v_i \beta_{j,k} + \psi_i \beta_{j,k} + \psi_j \beta_{i,k} + \psi v_j \beta_{i,k} + \psi_k \beta_{ij} + \psi v_k \beta_{ij} + \psi \beta_{ij,k}) \\
&\quad + e^v \beta (v_i \psi_{j,k} + \psi_j v_i v_k + \psi_k v_i v_j + \psi_{ij,k} + \psi_{ij} v_k + \psi_{i,k} v_j + \psi_i v_j v_k) \\
&\quad + e^v (\psi_j v_i \beta_k + \psi_k v_i \beta_j + \psi v_i v_k \beta_j + \psi v_i v_j \beta_k + \psi_{ij} \beta_k + \psi_i v_j \beta_k \\
&\quad + \psi_{i,k} \beta_j + \psi_i v_k \beta_j + \psi_{j,k} \beta_i + \psi_j v_k \beta_i + \psi_k v_j \beta_i + \psi v_j v_k \beta_i) - (h_g \beta)_{ij,k} \\
&= av_{ij,k} + e^v (\psi_k \beta + \psi \beta_k) v_{ij} + e^v \psi \beta v_k v_{ij} + e^v \psi \beta v_i v_j v_k \\
&\quad + (e^v (\psi \beta_j + \psi_j \beta + \psi \beta v_j) v_{i,k} + e^v (\psi \beta_i + \psi_i \beta + \psi \beta v_i) v_{j,k}) \\
&\quad + O_2(1) \sum_k v_k^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

By (25) and (28-30), at x_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(v + \gamma)_k (av_{k,i} + O_2(1) \sum_l |v_l| + O_1(1) \beta \sum_l v_l^2) \\
&= -\frac{\alpha'}{2L^2 \alpha} (a^2 \sum_l v_l^2 + O_2(1) \sum_l |v_l|) (av_i + O_2(1)) \\
&\quad - \frac{\rho_i}{2\rho} (a^2 \sum_l v_l^2 + O_2(1) \sum_l |v_l|),
\end{aligned}$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&a(v + \gamma)_k v_{k,i} + (av_k + O_2(1)) (O_2(1) \sum_l |v_l| + O_1(1) \beta \sum_l v_l^2) \\
&= -\frac{\alpha'}{2L^2 \alpha} a^3 \sum_l v_l^2 v_i + O_2(1) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \sum_l v_l^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$(v + \gamma)_k v_{k,i} = -\frac{\alpha'}{2L^2 \alpha} a^2 \sum_l v_l^2 v_i + O_1(1) \beta \sum_l |v_l|^3 + O_2(1) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \sum_l v_l^2, \tag{32}$$

where we used $a = 1 + \psi \beta e^v \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$.

Combine (28-32). At x_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2\alpha\rho(v+\gamma)_k\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_{ij,k} \geq \\
& 2\alpha a\rho(v+\gamma)_k\bar{L}^{ij}v_{ij,k} + 2\alpha\rho e^v(v_k+\gamma_k)(\psi_k\beta+\psi\beta_k+\psi\beta v_k)\bar{L}^{ij}v_{ij} \\
& + 4\alpha\rho e^v\bar{L}^{ij}(\psi\beta_j+\psi_j\beta)(v_k+\gamma_k)v_{i,k} + 4\alpha\rho e^v\psi\beta\bar{L}^{ij}v_j(v_k+\gamma_k)v_{i,k} \\
& + 2\alpha\rho e^v\psi\beta(v_k+\gamma_k)\bar{L}^{ij}v_iv_jv_k - C_2\rho\sum_{k,l}F^{ll}|v_k|^3 \\
& \geq 2\alpha a\rho(v+\gamma)_k\bar{L}^{ij}v_{ij,k} + 2\alpha\rho e^v(v+\gamma)_k(\psi_k\beta+\psi\beta_k+\psi\beta v_k)\bar{L}^{ij}v_{ij} \\
& + 4\alpha\rho e^v\bar{L}^{ij}(\psi\beta_j+\psi_j\beta)\left(-\frac{\alpha'}{2L^2\alpha}a^2\sum_l v_l^2v_i + O_1(1)\beta\sum_l|v_l|^3\right. \\
& \left.+ O_2(1)\sum_l v_l^2\right) \\
& + 4\alpha\rho e^v\psi\beta\bar{L}^{ij}v_j\left(-\frac{\alpha'}{2L^2\alpha}a^2\sum_l v_l^2v_i + O_1(1)\beta\sum_l|v_l|^3 + O_2(1)\sum_l v_l^2\right) \\
& + 2\alpha\rho e^v\psi\beta(av_k + O_2(1))\bar{L}^{ij}v_iv_jv_k - C_2\sum_{k,l}F^{ll}|v_k|^3 \\
& \geq 2\alpha a\rho(v+\gamma)_k\bar{L}^{ij}v_{ij,k} + 2\alpha\rho e^v(v+\gamma)_k(\psi_k\beta+\psi\beta_k+\psi\beta v_k)\bar{L}^{ij}v_{ij} \\
& - C_1\beta\rho\sum_{k,l}F^{ll}v_k^4 - C_2\rho\sum_{k,l}F^{ll}|v_k|^3,
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Recall the Laplace-Beltrami operator $\Delta_g = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_k}(\sqrt{|g|}g^{km}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_m})$, where $|g| = \det(g_{km})$.

$$\Delta_g v = g^{km}v_{m,k} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}}(\sqrt{|g|}g^{km})_k v_m = g^{km}v_{mk} + g^{km}\Gamma_{km}^l v_l + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}}(\sqrt{|g|}g^{km})_k v_m.$$

Since f is homogeneous of degree 1, the equation $F(\bar{W}_{ij}g^{jr}) = \phi e^{2v}$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi e^{2v} &= F^{ir}g^{jr}\left(v_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\Delta_g v)g_{ij} + \frac{2-t}{2}|\nabla v|_g^2 g_{ij} - v_iv_j - (A_g^t)_{ij}\right) \\
&= F^{ir}g^{jr}v_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\Delta_g v)\sum_l F^{ll} + \frac{2-t}{2}|\nabla v|_g^2\sum_l F^{ll} - F^{ir}g^{jr}v_iv_j - F^{ir}g^{jr}(A_g^t)_{ij} \\
&= F^{ir}g^{jr}v_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}\left(g^{km}v_{km} + g^{km}\Gamma_{km}^r v_r + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}}(\sqrt{|g|}g^{km})_k v_m\right)\sum_l F^{ll} \\
&\quad + \frac{2-t}{2}v_kv_l g^{kl}\sum_l F^{ll} - F^{ir}g^{jr}v_iv_j - F^{ir}g^{jr}(A_g^t)_{ij} \\
&= \bar{L}^{ij}v_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}g^{km}\Gamma_{km}^r v_r\sum_l F^{ll} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}\frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}}(\sqrt{|g|}g^{km})_k v_m\sum_l F^{ll} \\
&\quad + \frac{2-t}{2}v_kv_l g^{kl}\sum_l F^{ll} - F^{ir}g^{jr}v_iv_j - F^{ir}g^{jr}(A_g^t)_{ij},
\end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\bar{L}^{ij}v_{ij} = F^{ir}g^{jr}v_iv_j - \frac{2-t}{2}v_kv_lg^{kl}\sum_l F^{ll} + O_1(1)\sum_{k,l} F^{ll}|v_k|.$$

From which, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\alpha'\rho}{L^2}\sum_k (v+\gamma)_k^2 \bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_{ij} \\ = & \frac{\alpha'\rho}{L^2}\left(a^2\sum_k v_k^2 + O_2(1)\sum_k |v_k|\right)\bar{L}^{ij}\left(av_{ij} + O_2(1)\sum_k |v_k|\right. \\ & \left.+ O_1(1)\beta\sum_k v_k^2\right) \quad \text{by (29) and (30)} \\ \geq & \frac{a\alpha'\rho}{L^2}\left(a^2\sum_k v_k^2 + O_2(1)\sum_k |v_k|\right)\bar{L}^{ij}v_{ij} \\ & - C_1\beta\rho\sum_{k,l} F^{ll}v_k^4 - C_2\rho\sum_{k,l} F^{ll}|v_k|^3 \\ \geq & \frac{a\alpha'\rho}{L^2}\left(a^2\sum_k v_k^2 + O_2(1)\sum_k |v_k|\right)\left(F^{ir}g^{jr}v_iv_j - \frac{2-t}{2}v_kv_lg^{kl}\sum_i F^{ii}\right. \\ & \left.+ O_1(1)\sum_{k,l} F^{ll}|v_k|\right) - C_1\beta\rho\sum_{k,l} F^{ll}v_k^4 - C_2\rho\sum_{k,l} F^{ll}|v_k|^3 \\ \geq & \frac{a^3\alpha'\rho}{L^2}\sum_k v_k^2 F^{ir}g^{jr}v_iv_j - \frac{(2-t)a^3\alpha'\rho}{2L^2}v_kv_lg^{kl}\sum_{i,j} F^{ii}v_j^2 - C_1\beta\rho\sum_{k,l} F^{ll}v_k^4 \\ & - C_2\rho\sum_{k,l} F^{ll}|v_k|^3 \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

and

$$2\alpha\rho e^v(v+\gamma)_k(\psi_k\beta + \psi\beta_k + \psi\beta v_k)\bar{L}^{ij}v_{ij} \geq -C_1\beta\rho\sum_{k,l} F^{ll}v_k^4 - C_2\rho\sum_{k,l} F^{ll}|v_k|^3.$$

which implies, by (33), that

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\alpha\rho(v+\gamma)_k\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_{ij,k} \geq 2\alpha\rho(v+\gamma)_k\bar{L}^{ij}v_{ij,k} \\ & - C_1\beta\rho\sum_{k,l} F^{ll}v_k^4 - C_2\rho\sum_{k,l} F^{ll}|v_k|^3, \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Differentiate the equation $F(\bar{W}_{ij}g^{jr}) = \phi e^{2v}$ along the $y_k - th$ direction and evaluate at x_0 .

$$\begin{aligned}
& \phi_k e^{2v} + 2\psi e^{2v} v_k = F^{ir} \left(g^{jr} \bar{W}_{ij} \right)_k = F^{ir} g^{jr} (\bar{W}_{ij})_k + \frac{\partial g^{jr}}{\partial y_k} F^{ir} \bar{W}_{ij} \\
= & F^{ir} g^{jr} \left(v_{ij,k} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g v)_k g_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial y_k} (\Delta_g v) + \frac{2-t}{2} (2v_{m,k} v_l g^{ml} \right. \\
& \left. + v_m v_l \frac{\partial g^{ml}}{\partial y_k}) g_{ij} + \frac{2-t}{2} v_m v_l g^{ml} \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial y_k} - 2v_{i,k} v_j - (A_g^t)_{ij,k} \right) \\
& + \frac{\partial g^{jr}}{\partial y_k} F^{ir} \left(v_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g v) g_{ij} + \frac{2-t}{2} |\nabla v|_g^2 g_{ij} - v_i v_j - (A_g^t)_{ij} \right) \\
= & F^{ir} g^{jr} v_{ij,k} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g v)_k \sum_l F^{ll} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} F^{ir} g^{jr} \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial y_k} (\Delta_g v) \\
& + (2-t) v_{m,k} v_l g^{ml} \sum_i F^{ii} - 2F^{ir} g^{jr} v_{i,k} v_j + \frac{\partial g^{jr}}{\partial y_k} F^{ir} \left(v_{ij} \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g v) g_{ij} \right) + O_1(1) \sum_{i,j} F^{ii} v_j^2 \\
= & F^{ir} g^{jr} v_{ij,k} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} \left(g^{lm} v_{lm} + g^{lm} \Gamma_{lm}^r v_r + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{lm})_l v_m \right)_k \sum_i F^{ii} \\
& + \frac{1-t}{n-2} F^{ir} g^{jr} \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial y_k} \left(g^{lm} v_{lm} + g^{lm} \Gamma_{lm}^r v_r + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{lm})_l v_m \right) \\
& + (2-t) v_{m,k} v_l g^{ml} \sum_i F^{ii} - 2F^{ir} g^{jr} v_{i,k} v_j \\
& + \frac{\partial g^{jr}}{\partial y_k} F^{ir} \left(v_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (g^{lm} v_{lm} + g^{lm} \Gamma_{lm}^r v_r + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{lm})_l v_m) g_{ij} \right) \\
& + O_1(1) \sum_{i,j} F^{ii} v_j^2 \\
= & F^{ir} g^{jr} v_{ij,k} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} g^{lm} v_{lm,k} \sum_i F^{ii} + (2-t) v_{m,k} v_l g^{ml} \sum_i F^{ii} \\
& - 2F^{ir} g^{jr} v_{i,k} v_j + O_1(1) \sum_{i,j,l} F^{ii} |v_{j,l}| + O_1(1) \sum_{i,j} F^{ii} (v_j^2 + 1) \\
= & \bar{L}^{ij} v_{ij,k} + (2-t) v_{m,k} v_l g^{ml} \sum_i F^{ii} - 2F^{ir} g^{jr} v_{i,k} v_j \\
& + O_1(1) \sum_{i,j,l} F^{ii} |v_{j,l}| + \Gamma_{lj}^r v_r + O_1(1) \sum_{i,j} F^{ii} v_j^2 \\
= & \bar{L}^{ij} v_{ij,k} + (2-t) v_{m,k} v_l g^{ml} \sum_i F^{ii} - 2F^{ir} g^{jr} v_{i,k} v_j \\
& + O_1(1) \sum_{i,j,l} F^{ii} |v_{j,l}| + O_1(1) \sum_{i,j} F^{ii} v_j^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Multiply both sides by $2\alpha\alpha\rho(v+\gamma)_k$ and solve it for $2\alpha\alpha\rho(v+\gamma)_k \bar{L}^{ij} v_{ij,k}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2\alpha\alpha\rho(v+\gamma)_k \bar{L}^{ij} v_{ij,k} \\
= & -2(2-t)\alpha\alpha\rho(v+\gamma)_k v_{m,k} v_l g^{ml} \sum_i F^{ii} + 4\alpha\alpha\rho(v+\gamma)_k v_{i,k} F^{ir} g^{jr} v_j \\
& + O_1(1)\rho \sum_{i,j,k,l} F^{ii} |v_{j,l}| |(v+\gamma)_k| + O_1(1)\rho \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} v_j^2 |(v+\gamma)_k| \\
= & -2(2-t)\alpha\alpha\rho \left(-\frac{\alpha'}{2L^2\alpha} a^2 \sum_j v_j^2 v_m + O_1(1)\beta \sum_j |v_j|^3 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +O_2(1)\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}}\sum_j v_j^2)v_l g^{ml}\sum_i F^{ii} + 4\alpha a\rho\left(-\frac{\alpha'}{2L^2\alpha}a^2\sum_l v_l^2 v_i\right. \\
& +O_1(1)\beta\sum_l |v_l|^3 + O_2(1)\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}}\sum_l v_l^2)F^{ir}g^{jr}v_j \text{ by (32)} \\
& +O_1(1)\rho\sum_{i,j,k,l} F^{ii}|v_{j,l}||v_k| + O_2(1)\sqrt{\rho}\sum_{i,j} F^{ii}|v_j|^3 \\
\geq & \frac{(2-t)a^3\alpha'\rho}{L^2}\sum_{i,j} F^{ii}v_j^2 v_m v_l g^{ml} - \frac{2a^3\rho\alpha'}{L^2}\sum_l v_l^2 F^{ir}g^{jr}v_i v_j \\
& -C_1\beta\rho\sum_{i,j} F^{ii}v_j^4 - C_1\rho\sum_{i,j,k,l} F^{ii}|v_{j,l}||v_k| - C_2\sqrt{\rho}\sum_{i,j} F^{ii}|v_j|^3.
\end{aligned}$$

Substitute the above inequality into (35).

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2\alpha(v+\gamma)_k \bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_{ij,k} \\
\geq & \frac{(2-t)a^3\alpha'\rho}{L^2}\sum_{i,j} F^{ii}v_j^2 v_m v_l g^{ml} - \frac{2a^3\rho\alpha'}{L^2}\sum_l v_l^2 F^{ir}g^{jr}v_i v_j \\
& -C_1\beta\rho\sum_{i,j} F^{ii}v_j^4 - C_1\rho\sum_{i,j,k,l} F^{ii}|v_{j,l}||v_k| - C_2\sqrt{\rho}\sum_{i,j} F^{ii}|v_j|^3.
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

By (28) and (29),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\rho(\alpha\alpha''-2(\alpha')^2)}{L^4\alpha}\sum_k (v+\gamma)_k^2 \bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_i(v+\gamma)_j - C_1\sqrt{\rho}\sum_{k,l} F^{ll}|(v+\gamma)_k|^3 \\
\geq & \frac{\rho(\alpha\alpha''-2(\alpha')^2)}{L^4\alpha}\left(a^2v_k^2 + O_2(1)|v_k|\right)\bar{L}^{ij}(av_i + O_2(1))(av_j + O_2(1)) \\
& -C_1\sqrt{\rho}\sum_{k,l} F^{ll}\left(a^3|v_k|^3 + O_2(1)v_k^2\right) \\
\geq & \frac{\alpha''\alpha-2(\alpha')^2}{L^4\alpha}\rho a^4\sum_k v_k^2 \bar{L}^{ij}v_i v_j - C_2\sqrt{\rho}\sum_{k,l} F^{ll}|v_k|^3,
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2\rho\alpha\bar{L}^{ij}(v+\gamma)_{k,i}(v+\gamma)_{k,j} \\
= & 2\rho\alpha\bar{L}^{ij}\left(av_{k,i} + O_1(1)\beta\sum_l v_l^2 + O_2(1)\sum_l |v_l|\right)\left(av_{k,j} \right. \\
& \left. + O_1(1)\beta\sum_l v_l^2 + O_2(1)\sum_l |v_l|\right) \\
\geq & 2a^2\alpha\rho\bar{L}^{ij}v_{k,i}v_{k,j} - C_1\beta\rho\sum_{i,j,k,l} F^{ii}v_j^2|v_{k,l}| - C_2\rho\sum_{i,j,k,l} F^{ii}|v_j||v_{k,l}| \\
& -C_1\beta\rho\sum_{i,j} F^{ii}v_j^4 - C_2\rho\sum_{i,j} F^{ii}|v_j|^3.
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Substitute (34), (36), (37), and (38) into (27). We have,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \bar{L}^{ij}G_{ij}(x_0) \geq \frac{(2-t)a^3\alpha'\rho}{2L^2} \sum_{i,j} F^{ii}v_j^2v_mv_lg^{ml} - \frac{a^3\rho\alpha'}{L^2} \sum_l v_l^2 F^{ir}g^{jr}v_iv_j \\
&+ \frac{\alpha''\alpha-2(\alpha')^2}{L^4\alpha} \rho a^4 \sum_k v_k^2 \bar{L}^{ij}v_iv_j + 2a^2\alpha\rho \bar{L}^{ij}v_{k,i}v_{k,j} - C_1\beta\rho \sum_{i,j} F^{ii}v_j^4 \\
&- C_1\beta\rho \sum_{i,j,k,l} F^{ii}v_j^2|v_{k,l}| - C_2\rho \sum_{i,j,k,l} F^{ii}|v_{j,l}||v_k| - C_2\sqrt{\rho} \sum_{i,j} F^{ii}|v_j|^3.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall $a = 1 + \psi\beta e^v$. We can replace it by $1 + O_1(1)\beta$. Meanwhile we replace $\bar{L}^{ij}$ by $F^{ir}g^{rj} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\sum_l F^{ll})g^{ij}$ in the above inequality. We have,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \bar{L}^{ij}G_{ij}(x_0) \geq \frac{(2-t)\alpha'\rho}{2L^2} \sum_{i,j} F^{ii}v_j^2v_mv_lg^{ml} - \frac{\rho\alpha'}{L^2} \sum_l v_l^2 F^{ir}g^{jr}v_iv_j \\
&+ \frac{\rho(\alpha''\alpha - 2(\alpha')^2)}{L^4\alpha} \sum_k v_k^2 \left(F^{ir}g^{rj} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\sum_l F^{ll})g^{ij} \right) v_iv_j \\
&+ 2a^2\alpha\rho \left(F^{ir}g^{rj} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\sum_l F^{ll})g^{ij} \right) v_{k,i}v_{k,j} - C_1\beta\rho \sum_{i,j} F^{ii}v_j^4 \\
&- C_1\beta\rho \sum_{i,j,k,l} F^{ii}v_j^2|v_{k,l}| - C_2\rho \sum_{i,j,k,l} F^{ii}|v_{j,l}||v_k| - C_2\sqrt{\rho} \sum_{i,j} F^{ii}|v_j|^3 \\
&\geq \rho \left(\frac{(2-t)\alpha'}{2L^2} + \frac{(1-t)(\alpha\alpha'' - 2(\alpha')^2)}{(n-2)L^4\alpha} \right) \sum_{i,j} F^{ii}v_j^2v_mv_lg^{ml} \\
&+ \rho \left(\frac{\alpha''\alpha - 2(\alpha')^2}{L^4\alpha} - \frac{\alpha'}{L^2} \right) \sum_l v_l^2 F^{ir}g^{jr}v_iv_j \\
&+ \frac{2(1-t)a^2\alpha\rho}{n-2} (\sum_l F^{ll}) \left(\frac{1}{C_1} \delta^{ij} \right) v_{k,i}v_{k,j} - C_1\beta\rho \sum_{i,j} F^{ii}v_j^4 \\
&- C_1\beta\rho \sum_{i,j,k,l} F^{ii}v_j^2|v_{k,l}| - C_2\rho \sum_{i,j,k,l} F^{ii}|v_{j,l}||v_k| - C_2\sqrt{\rho} \sum_{i,j} F^{ii}|v_j|^3 \\
&\geq \rho \left(\frac{(2-t)\alpha'}{2L^2} + \frac{(1-t)(\alpha\alpha'' - 2(\alpha')^2)}{(n-2)L^4\alpha} \right) \sum_{i,j} F^{ii}v_j^2v_mv_lg^{ml} \\
&+ \rho \left(\frac{\alpha''\alpha - 2(\alpha')^2}{L^4\alpha} - \frac{\alpha'}{L^2} \right) \sum_l v_l^2 F^{ir}g^{jr}v_iv_j \\
&+ \frac{(1-t)a^2\alpha\rho}{(n-2)C_1} (\sum_l F^{ll}) v_{k,i}^2 - C_1\beta\rho \sum_{i,j} F^{ii}v_j^4 - C_2\sqrt{\rho} \sum_{i,j} F^{ii}|v_j|^3 \\
&\geq \rho \left(\frac{(2-t)\alpha'}{2L^2} + \frac{(1-t)(\alpha\alpha'' - 2(\alpha')^2)}{(n-2)L^4\alpha} \right) \sum_{i,j} F^{ii}v_j^2v_mv_lg^{ml}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +\rho\left(\frac{\alpha''\alpha - 2(\alpha')^2}{L^4\alpha} - \frac{\alpha'}{L^2}\right) \sum_l v_l^2 F^{ir} g^{jr} v_i v_j \\
& -C_1\beta\rho \sum_{i,j} F^{ii} v_j^4 - C_2\sqrt{\rho} \sum_{i,j} F^{ii} |v_j|^3.
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

It is enough to find a smooth function $\alpha : [\frac{1}{L^2}, \frac{2}{L}] \rightarrow R^+$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \alpha' > 0 \\ \alpha\alpha'' - 2(\alpha')^2 - L^2\alpha\alpha' > 0. \end{cases} \tag{40}$$

since the above inequalities imply that

$$\frac{\alpha''\alpha - 2(\alpha')^2}{L^4\alpha} - \frac{\alpha'}{L^2} = \frac{1}{L^4\alpha}(\alpha\alpha'' - 2(\alpha')^2 - L^2\alpha\alpha') > 0,$$

and

$$\alpha\alpha'' - 2(\alpha')^2 > L^2\alpha\alpha' > 0,$$

and

$$\frac{(2-t)\alpha'}{2L^2} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} \frac{\alpha''\alpha - 2(\alpha')^2}{L^4\alpha} > 0,$$

i.e., the coefficients of the two leading terms in the inequality (39) are both positive, which will lead the preferred gradient bound.

Let $\alpha = e^\eta$. The two inequalities in (40) are equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \eta' > 0 \\ \eta'' - (\eta')^2 - L^2\eta' > 0. \end{cases}$$

To find α , let $\eta(s) = s^r$ with $r \gg 1$ being chosen later. Clearly, $\eta' > 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta'' - (\eta')^2 - L^2\eta' &= rs^{r-2}((r-1) - rs^r - L^2s) \\
&\geq rs^{r-2}\left((r-1) - r\left(\frac{2}{L}\right)^r - L^2\left(\frac{2}{L}\right)\right) \\
&= rs^{r-2}\left((r-1) - r\left(\frac{2}{L}\right)^r - 2L\right) \\
&\geq rs^{r-2}\left((r-1) - \frac{r}{2} - 2L\right) \quad \text{by choosing } L > 4 \\
&= rs^{r-2}\left(\frac{r}{2} - 1 - 2L\right) \geq rs^{r-2} > 0 \quad \text{by choosing } r > 4 + 4L.
\end{aligned}$$

Pick $L > |v + \gamma| + 4$ and $r > 4 + 4L$. Then we have $\frac{v+\gamma+L}{L^2} \in [\frac{1}{L^2}, \frac{2}{L}]$ and there exists a universal constant $C_3 > 0$ independent of β such that (40) holds. By (39),

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \bar{L}^{ij} G_{ij}(x_0) \geq C_3 \rho \sum_{i,j,k,l} v_l^2 F^{kk} \left(\frac{1}{C_1} \delta^{ij} \right) v_i v_j - C_1 \beta \rho \sum_{i,j} F^{ii} v_j^4 - C_2 \sqrt{\rho} \sum_{i,j} F^{ii} |v_j|^3 \\
&\geq C_3 \rho \sum_{k,l} v_l^4 F^{kk} - C_1 \beta \rho \sum_{i,j} F^{ii} v_j^4 - C_2 \sqrt{\rho} \sum_{i,j} F^{ii} |v_j|^3 \\
&\geq \frac{C_3}{2} \rho \sum_{k,l} v_l^2 F^{kk} - C_2 \sqrt{\rho} \sum_{i,j} F^{ii} |v_j|^3,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality, we used $\beta \in [0, 2\delta_0]$, therefore we can pick $\delta_0 \ll 1$ such that $C_1 \beta \leq \frac{C_3}{2}$.

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \frac{C_3}{2} \rho \sum_{k,l} v_l^4 F^{kk} - C_2 \sum_{i,j} F^{jj} |v_i|^3 \geq C_3 \rho \sum_k F^{kk} (\sum_l v_l^2)^2 - C_2 \sum_j F^{jj} (\sum_i v_i^2)^{\frac{3}{2}} \\
&= \rho \sum_{k,l} F^{kk} v_l^2 \left(C_3 \sum_i v_i^2 - C_2 \sum_i v_i^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\sum_i v_i^2 \leq C$, therefore $G(x_0) \leq C$. In particular $\sum_i v_i^2 \leq C$ in $B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0})$. From which, we have, in $B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0})$,

$$|\nabla v|_g^2 = v_k v_l g^{kl} \leq C \sum_k v_k^2 \leq C.$$

By $\cup_{i_0=1}^N \left(B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{64}}^T(y^{i_0}) \cap \partial M \right) = \partial M$, $|\nabla v|_g^2 \leq C$ on ∂M . The Lemma 5.1 has been established. ♣

Remark 5.1 When the manifold (M^n, g) is umbilic on the boundary, the above lemma and therefore the next lemma also hold for $t = 1$. The above proof still works after a slight modification.

Lemma 5.2 Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.2, for $t < 1$, let v be a C^3 solution of the equation (12). Then there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ depending only on (M^n, g, t) , (f, Γ) , ϕ , and ψ , such that

$$|\nabla v|_g \leq C \quad \text{on } M.$$

Proof of the Lemma 5.2. Consider

$$\bar{G} := |\nabla v|_g^2 \bar{\alpha} \left(\frac{v + L}{L^2} \right),$$

where $L > 0$ is a constant satisfying $1 < v + L < 2L$ and $\alpha : R^+ \rightarrow R^+$ is a smooth positive function to be chosen later. Let $\bar{G}(x_0) = \max_M G$. Let $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$ be a geodesic normal coordinates w.r.t. the metric g at x_0 . W.l.o.g., we can assume x_0 is an interior point of M . In the following, subindices are taken w.r.t. $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$. Repeat the arguments in the proof of the Lemma 5.1. We arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \bar{L}^{ij} \bar{G}_{ij}(x_0) \geq \left(\frac{(2-t)\alpha'}{2L^2} + \frac{(1-t)(\alpha\alpha'' - 2(\alpha')^2)}{(n-2)L^4\alpha} \right) |\nabla v|_g^4 \sum_i F^{ii} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\alpha''\alpha - 2(\alpha')^2}{L^4\alpha} - \frac{\alpha'}{L^2} \right) |\nabla v|_g^2 F^{ij} v_i v_j - C |\nabla v|_g^3 \sum_i F^{ii}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose the same α as in the proof of the Lemma 5.1. We conclude that there exists some universal constant $C_3 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \bar{L}^{ij} \bar{G}_{ij}(x_0) \geq C_3 |\nabla v|_g^4 \sum_i F^{ii} - C |\nabla v|_g^3 \sum_i F^{ii} \\ &\geq |\nabla v|_g^3 \sum_i F^{ii} (C_3 |\nabla v|_g - C), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $|\nabla v|_g(x_0) \leq C$ and therefore $G(x_0) \leq C$. The Lemma 5.2 has been proved. ♣

6 Hessian Estimates

The main issue of the Hessian estimates is to bound the Hessian of the solutions on the boundary of M .

Lemma 6.1 *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.2, for $t < 1$, let v be a C^4 solution of the equation (12). For any $1 \leq i_0 \leq N$, there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ depending only on (M^n, g, t) , (f, Γ) , ϕ , ψ , and $\delta_{y^{i_0}}$ such that in $B_{\frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0})$,*

$$|v_{\tau\tau}| < C, \quad \text{for any unit direction } \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \text{ satisfying } g\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}\right) = 0.$$

Proof of the Lemma 6.1. Consider

$$\bar{H}(y) := \rho e^{\beta_0 y_n} \left(\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \max_{\tau \in T_y M, \|\tau\|_g = 1,} \\ g\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}\right) = 0 \end{array} \right. (\nabla^2 v + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 g)(\tau, \tau) \right\} - s_0 v_\nu(y) \right),$$

where $(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is the tubular neighborhood normal coordinates of $y \in B_{\delta \frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}^T(y^{i_0})$ at y^{i_0} , γ, ρ are the same as in the proof of Lemma 5.1, and $a > 0$, $\beta_0 > 0$, $s_0 > 0$ are constants to be chosen later.

Let $\bar{H}(x_0) = \frac{\max_{B_{\delta \frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}^T(y^{i_0})} \bar{H}}{B_{\delta \frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}^T(y^{i_0})}$ for some $x_0 \in B_{\delta \frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}^T(y^{i_0})$.

Claim 6.1 *Either $\bar{H}(x_0) < C$ or x_0 is an interior point of $B_{\delta \frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}^T(y^{i_0})$ by choosing $\beta_0, s_0 \gg 1$.*

Proof of the Claim 6.1. If not, we assume $H(x_0) \geq 1$ and $x_0 \in B_{\delta \frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}^T(y^{i_0}) \cap \partial M$. Let $\{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$ be a tubular neighborhood normal coordinates at x_0 . Then $\{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$ is well-defined and smooth near x_0 . Meanwhile, $y_n = \bar{x}_n$ near x_0 since they both represent the distance parameter to the boundary ∂M , which is to say $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ has the same definition near x_0 . Recall that $g(\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_j}) = \delta_{ij}$ at x_0 . W.l.o.g., we can assume $\bar{H}(x_0) := \rho e^{\beta_0 y_n} (v_{11} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0 v_\nu)(x_0)$, where and in the following subindices denote the covariant derivatives w.r.t. $\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_i}$. Let

$$H(x) := \rho e^{\beta_0 y_n} \left(\frac{v_{11}}{g_{11}} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0 v_\nu \right).$$

By $g(\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}) = 0$ near x_0 , we know x_0 is a local minimum point of H . Moreover $\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_n} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ near x_0 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2)_\nu(x_0) &= \left((v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_l g^{kl} \right)_\nu \\ &= 2(v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_{k,\nu} + (v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_l g_\nu^{kl} \\ &= -2(v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_{k,n} + (v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_l g_\nu^{kl} \\ &= -2(v + \gamma)_k \frac{\partial^2(v + \gamma)}{\partial \bar{x}_n \partial \bar{x}_k} + (v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_l g_\nu^{kl} \\ &= -2(v + \gamma)_k \frac{\partial^2(v + \gamma)}{\partial \bar{x}_k \partial \bar{x}_n} + (v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_l g_\nu^{kl} \\ &= -2(v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_{n,k} + (v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_l g_\nu^{kl} \\ &= 2(v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_{\nu,k} + (v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_l g_\nu^{kl}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $(v + \gamma)_\nu|_{\partial M} = 0$ by (23), we have $(v + \gamma)_{\nu,k}(x_0) = 0$ for $k \leq n - 1$, which implies that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n (v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_{\nu,k}(x_0) = (v + \gamma)_n (v + \gamma)_{\nu,n} = -(v + \gamma)_\nu (v + \gamma)_{\nu,n} = 0.$$

Thus $(|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2)_\nu(x_0) = (v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_l g_\nu^{kl}$. By (22), $y_n = 0$ at x_0 , and $\frac{\partial y_n}{\partial \nu} = -\frac{\partial y_n}{\partial y_n} = -1$ in $B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}^T(y^{i_0})$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq H_\nu(x_0) &= \left(v_{11,\nu} + a(v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_l g_\nu^{kl} - v_{11} g_{11,\nu} - s_0 v_{\nu,\nu} \right) \rho e^{\beta_0 y_n} \\ &\quad - \beta_0 (v_{11} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0 v_\nu) \rho e^{\beta_0 y_n} \\ &= \rho \left(v_{11,\nu} - \beta_0 (v_{11} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0 v_\nu) - v_{11} g_{11,\nu} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - s_0 v_{n,n} + a(v + \gamma)_k (v + \gamma)_l g_\nu^{kl} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

We need to interchange $v_{11,\nu}$ to $\frac{\partial^2(v_\nu)}{\partial \bar{x}_1 \partial \bar{x}_1}$ in the above equation so that we can use the boundary condition. Recall $\{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_{n-1}\}$ is the geodesic normal coordinates w.r.t. the metric $g|_{\partial M}$ at x_0 . Then $\bar{\nabla} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_l} (x_0) = 0$ for $1 \leq k, l \leq n-1$, where $\bar{\nabla}$ is the covariant derivative of ∂M induced by $g|_{\partial M}$. For $1 \leq k, l \leq n-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{kl}^i(x_0) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_i} &= \nabla \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_k} (x_0) = \bar{\nabla} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_k} (x_0) + II\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_l}\right)(x_0) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_l} \\ &= -II\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_l}\right)(x_0) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing both sides of the above equation, we have, at x_0 ,

$$\Gamma_{kl}^i = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i, k, l \leq n-1, \quad \Gamma_{kl}^n = -II\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_l}\right). \quad (42)$$

Hence at x_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned} v_{11,\nu} &= -v_{11,n} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_n} \left(\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial \bar{x}_1 \partial \bar{x}_1} - \Gamma_{11}^l v_l \right) \\ &= -\frac{\partial^3 v}{\partial \bar{x}_n \partial \bar{x}_1 \partial \bar{x}_1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_n} (\Gamma_{11}^l) v_l + \Gamma_{11}^l v_{l,n} \\ &= -\frac{\partial^3 v}{\partial \bar{x}_n \partial \bar{x}_1 \partial \bar{x}_1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_n} (\Gamma_{11}^l) v_l + \Gamma_{11}^n v_{n,n} \quad \text{by (42)} \\ &= -\frac{\partial^3 v}{\partial \bar{x}_1 \partial \bar{x}_1 \partial \bar{x}_n} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_n} (\Gamma_{11}^l) v_l + \Gamma_{11}^n v_{n,n} \\ &= \frac{\partial^2(v_\nu)}{\partial \bar{x}_1 \partial \bar{x}_1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_n} (\Gamma_{11}^l) v_l + \Gamma_{11}^n v_{n,n} \\ &= \frac{\partial^2(\psi e^v - h_g)}{\partial \bar{x}_1 \partial \bar{x}_1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_n} (\Gamma_{11}^l) v_l + \Gamma_{11}^n v_{n,n} \\ &= e^v \psi \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial \bar{x}_1 \partial \bar{x}_1} + e^v \psi v_1^2 + 2e^v \psi_1 v_1 + e^v \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial \bar{x}_1 \partial \bar{x}_1} + \frac{\partial^2 h_g}{\partial \bar{x}_1 \partial \bar{x}_1} \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_n} (\Gamma_{11}^l) v_l + \Gamma_{11}^n v_{n,n}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second to last equality, we used the fact that $\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_1}$ is a tangent vector field of ∂M near x_0 , so we can replace v_ν by $e^v \psi - h_g$.

In the following, we use $C > 0$ to denote a universal constant independent of β_0 . Substitute the above equation into the inequality (41).

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq H_\nu(x_0) = \rho \left(e^v \psi \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial \bar{x}_1 \partial \bar{x}_1} - \beta_0(v_{11} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0 v_\nu) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - v_{11} g_{11,\nu} - (s_0 - \Gamma_{11}^n) v_{n,n} + C \right) \\
&= \rho \left(e^v \psi v_{11} + e^v \psi \Gamma_{11}^l v_l - \beta_0(v_{11} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0 v_\nu) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - v_{11} g_{11,\nu} - (s_0 - \Gamma_{11}^n) v_{n,n} + C \right) \\
&\leq \rho \left((e^v \psi - \beta_0 - g_{11,\nu})(v_{11} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0 v_\nu) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - (s_0 - \Gamma_{11}^n) v_{n,n} + C \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Since $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ is the tangent vector of geodesic curves, we have $\nabla \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}} = 0$ near x_0 . In particular, we have

$$v_{n,n}(x_0) = v_{\nu,\nu}(x_0) = v_{\nu\nu} + \left(\nabla \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}} \right) v = v_{\nu\nu} = v_{nn}(x_0).$$

Recall $\Gamma_{11}^n = -II(\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}_1})$ by (42). We can pick $s_0 \gg 1$ such that $\frac{s_0}{2}$ is bigger than the largest absolute value of the principle curvatures of the second fundamental form on ∂M . Then we have $\frac{3s_0}{2} \geq s_0 - \Gamma_{11}^n \geq \frac{s_0}{2} > 0$ at x_0 . By $\Gamma \subset \Gamma_1$, we have

$$\left(1 + \frac{(1-t)n}{n-2}\right) \Delta_g v + \left(\frac{(2-t)n}{2} - 1\right) |\nabla v|_g^2 - \frac{(2-t)n-2}{2(n-1)(n-2)} R_g > 0,$$

which implies that $\Delta_g v(x_0) \geq -C$. W.l.o.g., we assume $v_{11}(x_0) > 1$ and $v_{kk}(x_0) \leq C v_{11}(x_0)$ for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$. Then

$$-v_{n,n}(x_0) = -v_{nn}(x_0) \leq C + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} v_{kk}(x_0) \leq C v_{11}(x_0),$$

and

$$-(s_0 - \Gamma_{11}^n) v_{n,n}(x_0) \leq C(s_0 - \Gamma_{11}^n) v_{11} \leq \frac{3C s_0}{2} v_{11} \leq C s_0 v_{11}.$$

Substitute the above inequality into (43).

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq H_\nu(x_0) \\
&\leq \rho\left((e^v\psi - \beta_0 - g_{11,\nu})(v_{11} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0v_\nu) + Cs_0v_{11} + C\right) \\
&\leq \rho\left((e^v\psi + Cs_0 - g_{11,\nu} - \beta_0)(v_{11} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0v_\nu) + C\right) \\
&\leq \rho\left((C - \beta_0)(v_{11} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0v_\nu) + C\right) \\
&\leq \rho\left(-(v_{11} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0v_\nu) + C\right) \quad \text{by choosing } \beta_0 > C + 1,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $(v_{11} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0v_\nu)(x_0) < C$ and $H(x_0) < C$. The Claim 6.1 has been proved. ♣.

Due to the above claim, we assume x_0 is an interior point of $B_{\delta_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}}^T(y^{i_0})$. To continue the proof of the Lemma 6.1, we need to introduce a new coordinates near x_0 . Let $d_0 = d(x_0, \partial M)$, and let $\mathcal{S}_0 := \{y \in B_{\delta_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}}^T(y^{i_0}) \mid y_n = d_0\}$. As shown in the proof of the Proposition 4.2, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ is still the unit normal vector field of $\mathcal{S}_0$. For any $x \in B_{\delta_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}}^T(y^{i_0})$ but near x_0 with $(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ as its tubular neighborhood normal coordinates of x at y^{i_0} , then $\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n y_j^2} < \frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{16}$. We conclude that there exists a unique $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{S}_0$ such that $d(x, \tilde{x}) = d(x, \mathcal{S}_0)$. In fact for such x , let $\bar{x} = (y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}, 0)$. Then $\bar{x}$ is the unique point on ∂M such that $d(\bar{x}, x) = d(x, \partial M) = y_n$. Consider $r(t) = E(\bar{x}, t)$. Then $r(t)$ is smooth and well defined for $t \in [0, \delta_{y^{i_0}})$, $r(y_n) = x$, and

$$\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j^2 + (\max\{d_0, y_n\})^2} < \frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{16}$$

as long as x is close to x_0 enough since x is an interior point of $B_{\delta_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}}^T(y^{i_0})$. Moreover for $t \in [0, \max\{d_0, y_n\}]$, the tubular neighborhood normal coordinates of $r(t)$ at y^{i_0} is $(y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}, t)$, which implies that the curve $r([0, \max\{d_0, y_n\}]) \subset B_{\delta_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}}^T(y^{i_0})$, therefore intersects with $\mathcal{S}_0$ at a unique point $r(d_0)$. As shown in the proof of the Proposition 4.2, i.e., by (19) and (20), $d(r(t), \mathcal{S}_0) = |t - d_0|$ for $t \in [0, \frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{2})$. In particular,

$$d(x, \mathcal{S}_0) = d(r(y_n), \mathcal{S}_0) = d(r(y_n), r(d_0)) = |y_n - d_0|. \quad (44)$$

Next, we want to show that there exists only one point $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{S}_0$ such that $d(x, \tilde{x}) = d(x, \mathcal{S}_0)$. This is because if $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is the tubular neighborhood normal coordinates of $\tilde{x}$ at y^{i_0} , then $\hat{x} := (a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, 0) \in B_{\delta_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{16}}}^T(y^{i_0}) \cap \partial M \subset B_{\delta_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{8}}}^T(y^{i_0}) \cap \partial M$ by

the Proposition 4.3. Thus $\hat{r}(t) := E(\hat{x}, t)$ is smooth and well-defined for $t \in [0, \delta_{y^{i_0}})$ and $\hat{r}(a_n) = \tilde{x}$. Let $\tilde{r}(t)$ be the shortest normalized geodesic connecting x with $\tilde{x}$. Then $\tilde{r}$ has $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ as its tangent vector at $\tilde{x}$. Since $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ is also the tangent vector of $\hat{r}$ at $\hat{r}(a_n) = \tilde{x}$, we know $\tilde{r}$ and $\hat{r}$ coincide. Hence $\hat{r}(y_n) = x$, which implies that $E(\hat{x}, y_n) = x = E(\bar{x}, y_n)$, and $\hat{x} = \bar{x}$ since E is a diffeomorphism in $B_{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}(y^{i_0})$. Therefore $\tilde{x} = r(d_0)$ is uniquely determined by x . Clearly $r(d_0) \in \mathcal{S}_0$ is near x_0 as long as x is near x_0 . Let $\{x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}\}$ be the geodesic normal coordinates w.r.t. the metric $g|_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ at x_0 . Then $\{x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}\}$ is smooth and well-defined near x_0 in $\mathcal{S}_0$. For any $x \in B_{\frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{16}}(y^{i_0})$ and near x_0 , there exists a unique $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{S}_0$ such that $d(\tilde{x}, x) = d(x, \mathcal{S}_0)$.

We assume x is close enough to x_0 such that the geodesic normal coordinates of $\tilde{x}$ w.r.t. the metric $g|_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ at x_0 is smooth and well-defined. Let $(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ be such geodesic normal coordinates of $\tilde{x}$ w.r.t. the metric $g|_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ at x_0 . Define $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ to be the new coordinates of x such that $x_n = y_n - d_0$. Then $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$ is smooth and well-defined for x near x_0 , and $d(x, \mathcal{S}_0) = |y_n - d_0| = |x_n|$ by (44). As shown in the proof of the Proposition 4.2, for x near x_0 and for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y_n} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}, \quad g\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}\right) = 0. \quad (45)$$

Let II_0 denote the second fundamental form of g w.r.t. $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ on $\mathcal{S}_0$ and let $\tilde{\nabla}$ be the Levi-Civita connection induced by $g|_{\mathcal{S}_0}$. Recall on $\mathcal{S}_0$, $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{n-1}$ is the geodesic normal coordinates w.r.t. the metric $g|_{\mathcal{S}_0}$ at x_0 . Therefore $g_{lm}(x_0) := g(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_l}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_m})(x_0) = \delta_{lm}$ for $1 \leq l, m \leq n$, and $\tilde{\nabla}_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}(x_0) = 0$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$, which implies that

$$\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}(x_0) = \tilde{\nabla}_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} + II_0\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} = II_0\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}.$$

Thus for $1 \leq i, j, k \leq n-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} g_{ij}(x_0) &= g\left(\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\right) + g\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\right) \\ &= g\left(II_0\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\right) + g\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, II_0\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}\right) \\ &= 0 \quad \text{by (45)}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Also by (45), we have, for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, $g_{in} = 0$ near x_0 , which implies that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} g_{in}(x_0) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} g_{ni}(x_0) = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq n. \quad (47)$$

Notice that $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ is a unit vector field. Therefore $g_{nn} \equiv 1$ near x_0 , and for $1 \leq k \leq n$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} g_{nn}(x_0) = 0. \quad (48)$$

Combine (46)-(48). We have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} g_{ij}(x_0) = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i, j \leq n \quad \text{and } 1 \leq k \leq n-1. \quad (49)$$

Recall $\mathcal{G} = (g_{ij})$. $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{G}^{-1} = I_{n \times n}$ implies that $\frac{\partial \mathcal{G}^{-1}}{\partial x_k} = -\mathcal{G}^{-1} \frac{\partial \mathcal{G}}{\partial x_k} \mathcal{G}^{-1}$. For $1 \leq k \leq n-1$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} g^{ij}(x_0) = -g^{ir} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} g_{rs} \right) g^{sj} = 0. \quad (50)$$

In the following, subindices denote the covariant derivatives w.r.t. $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$. Notice that $g_{ij}(x_0) = \delta_{ij}$. W.l.o.g., we assume

$$\bar{H}(x_0) = \rho e^{\beta_0 d_0} (v_{11} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0 v_\nu),$$

and $v_{1,1}(x_0) \gg 1$.

Let

$$\tilde{H} = \rho e^{\beta_0(x_n + d_0)} \left(\frac{v_{11}}{g_{11}} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0 v_\nu \right).$$

By (45), x_0 is a local maximum point of $\tilde{H}$. Near x_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_i &= \rho e^{\beta_0(x_n + d_0)} \left(\frac{v_{11,i}}{g_{11}} - \frac{v_{11}}{g_{11}^2} g_{11,i} + 2ag^{kl}(v + \gamma)_k(v + \gamma)_{l,i} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + ag_{,i}^{kl}(v + \gamma)_k(v + \gamma)_l - s_0 v_{\nu,i} \right) + \left(\frac{\rho_i}{\rho} + \delta_{ni}\beta_0 \right) H. \end{aligned}$$

At x_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned} v_{11,i} - g_{11,i} v_{11} + 2a(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_{k,i} + \gamma_{k,i}) + ag_{,i}^{kl}(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_l + \gamma_l) \\ - s_0 v_{\nu,i} = -\left(\frac{\rho_i}{\rho} + \delta_{ni}\beta_0 \right) (v_{11} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0 v_\nu), \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_{ij}(x_0) &= \\ &\rho e^{\beta_0 d_0} \left(v_{11,ij} - g_{11,j} v_{11,i} - g_{11,i} v_{11,j} + 2g_{11,i} g_{11,j} v_{11} - g_{11,ij} v_{11} \right. \\ &\quad + 2a(v_{k,i} + \gamma_{k,i})(v_{k,j} + \gamma_{k,j}) + 2a(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_{k,ij} + \gamma_{k,ij}) \\ &\quad + 2ag_{,j}^{kl}(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_{l,i} + \gamma_{l,i}) + 2ag_{,i}^{kl}(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_{l,j} + \gamma_{l,j}) \\ &\quad \left. + ag_{,ij}^{kl}(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_l + \gamma_l) - s_0 v_{\nu,ij} \right) \\ &\quad + \beta_0 \delta_{nj} \rho e^{\beta_0 d_0} \left(v_{11,i} - g_{11,i} v_{11} + 2a(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_{k,i} + \gamma_{k,i}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + ag_{,i}^{kl}(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_l + \gamma_l) - s_0 v_{\nu,i} \\
& + \rho_j e^{\beta_0 d_0} (v_{11,i} - g_{11,i} v_{11} + 2a(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_{k,i} + \gamma_{k,i}) \\
& + ag_{,i}^{kl}(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_l + \gamma_l) - s_0 v_{\nu,i}) \\
& + \left(\frac{\rho_{ij}\rho - \rho_i\rho_j}{\rho} \right) (v_{11} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0 v_{\nu}) e^{\beta_0 d_0},
\end{aligned}$$

so by (51),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \rho^{-1} e^{-\beta_0 d_0} \tilde{H}_{ij}(x_0) = \\
& \left(v_{11,ij} - g_{11,j} v_{11,i} - g_{11,i} v_{11,j} + 2g_{11,i} g_{11,j} v_{11} - g_{11,ij} v_{11} \right. \\
& + 2a(v_{k,i} + \gamma_{k,i})(v_{k,j} + \gamma_{k,j}) + 2a(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_{k,ij} + \gamma_{k,ij}) \\
& + 2ag_{,ij}^{kl}(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_{l,i} + \gamma_{l,i}) + 2ag_{,i}^{kl}(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_{l,j} + \gamma_{l,j}) \\
& \left. + ag_{,ij}^{kl}(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_l + \gamma_l) - s_0 v_{\nu,ij} \right) \\
& + \left(\frac{\rho_{ij}\rho - 2\rho_i\rho_j}{\rho^2} - \frac{\beta_0(\rho_i\delta_{nj} + \rho_j\delta_{ni})}{\rho} - \beta_0^2 \delta_{ni}\delta_{nj} \right) (v_{11} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0 v_{\nu}),
\end{aligned}$$

Recall in the proof of the Claim 6.1, the choice of β_0 depends on a . We need to prove the choice of a is independent of β_0 . For this reason, we let C_1 denote the universal constant depending only on (M^n, g, t) , (f, Γ) , ϕ , ψ and $\delta_{y^{i_0}}$, but independent of a , β_0 , and let C_2 denote the universal constant depending on (M^n, g, t) , (f, Γ) , ϕ , ψ , $\delta_{y^{i_0}}$, and a , β_0 .

Notice that $g_{ij}(x_0) = \delta_{ij}$ and $\bar{L}^{ij}(x_0) = F^{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\sum_l F^{ll})\delta^{ij}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
0 & \geq \rho^{-1} e^{-\beta_0 d_0} \bar{L}^{ij} \tilde{H}_{ij}(x_0) \\
& \geq \bar{L}^{ij} \left(v_{11,ij} - 2g_{11,j} v_{11,i} + 2a(v_{k,j} + \gamma_{k,j})(v_{k,i} + \gamma_{k,i}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + 2a(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_{k,ij} + \gamma_{k,ij}) - s_0 v_{\nu,ij} \right) - C_2 \rho^{-1} \sum_l F^{ll} |v_{k,i}|,
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

where we used $|\nabla\rho| < C_1\sqrt{\rho}$, $|\nabla^2\rho| < C_1$, and $v_{1,1}(x_0) \geq 1$.

By (51),

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{11,i}(x_0) & = -2a(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_{k,i} + \gamma_{k,i}) - ag_{,i}^{kl}(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_l + \gamma_l) - s_0 v_{\nu,i} \\
& \quad + g_{11,i} v_{11} - \left(\frac{\rho_i}{\rho} + \delta_{ni}\beta_0 \right) (v_{11} + a|\nabla(v + \gamma)|_g^2 - s_0 v_{\nu}),
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Substitute the above into (52). Since $v_{\nu,i} = -v_{n,i}$ and $v_{11} = v_{1,1} - \Gamma_{11}^l v_l$,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 & \geq \rho^{-1} e^{-\beta_0 d_0} \bar{L}^{ij} \tilde{H}_{ij}(x_0) \\
& \geq \bar{L}^{ij} \left(v_{11,ij} + 2a(v_{k,j} + \gamma_{k,j})(v_{k,i} + \gamma_{k,i}) \right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +2a(v_k + \gamma_k)(v_{k,ij} + \gamma_{k,ij}) - s_0 v_{\nu,ij} \Big) - C_2 \rho^{-1} \sum_l F^l |v_{k,i}| \\
& \geq \bar{L}^{ij} \Big(v_{11,ij} + 2a(1 + \psi \beta e^v)^2 v_{k,j} v_{k,i} + 2a(1 + \psi \beta e^v)(v_k + \gamma_k) v_{k,ij} \\
& \quad - s_0 v_{\nu,ij} \Big) - C_2 \rho^{-1} \sum_l F^l |v_{k,i}|
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

At x_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{ij,l} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l} (\nabla^2 v (\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j})) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l} (\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x_j \partial x_i} - \Gamma_{ji}^k v_k) \\
&= \frac{\partial^3 v}{\partial x_l \partial x_j \partial x_i} - \Gamma_{ji}^k v_{k,l} - \frac{\partial(\Gamma_{ji}^k)}{\partial x_l} v_k,
\end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{l,ij} &= (\nabla^2 v_l) (\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}) = (\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}} \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}} - \Gamma_{ji}^k \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}) (v_l) \\
&= \frac{\partial^3 v}{\partial x_j \partial x_i \partial x_l} - \Gamma_{ji}^k v_{l,k} \\
&= v_{ij,l} + \frac{\partial(\Gamma_{ji}^k)}{\partial x_l} v_k,
\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{ij,11} &= (\nabla^2 v_{ij}) (\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}) = (\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}} \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}} - \Gamma_{11}^l \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l}) v_{ij} \\
&= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_1 \partial x_1} (\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x_j \partial x_i} - \Gamma_{ji}^l v_l) - \Gamma_{11}^l v_{ij,l} \\
&= \frac{\partial^4 v}{\partial x_1 \partial x_1 \partial x_j \partial x_i} - \Gamma_{ji}^l v_{l,1,1} - 2 \frac{\partial(\Gamma_{ji}^l)}{\partial x_1} v_{l,1} - \frac{\partial^2(\Gamma_{ji}^l)}{\partial x_1 \partial x_1} v_l - \Gamma_{11}^l v_{ij,l} \\
&= \frac{\partial^4 v}{\partial x_1 \partial x_1 \partial x_j \partial x_i} - \Gamma_{ji}^l (v_{11} + \Gamma_{11}^k v_k)_l - 2 \frac{\partial(\Gamma_{ji}^l)}{\partial x_1} v_{l,1} \\
&\quad - \frac{\partial^2(\Gamma_{ji}^l)}{\partial x_1 \partial x_1} v_l - \Gamma_{11}^l (v_{i,j} - \Gamma_{ji}^k v_k)_l \\
&= \frac{\partial^4 v}{\partial x_1 \partial x_1 \partial x_j \partial x_i} - \Gamma_{ji}^l v_{11,l} - \Gamma_{ji}^l \Gamma_{11}^k v_{k,l} - \frac{\partial \Gamma_{11}^k}{\partial x_l} \Gamma_{ji}^l v_k \\
&\quad - 2 \frac{\partial(\Gamma_{ji}^l)}{\partial x_1} v_{l,1} - \frac{\partial^2(\Gamma_{ji}^l)}{\partial x_1 \partial x_1} v_l - \Gamma_{11}^l v_{i,j,l} - \Gamma_{11}^l \Gamma_{ji}^k v_{k,l} - \frac{\partial \Gamma_{ji}^k}{\partial x_l} \Gamma_{11}^l v_k,
\end{aligned}$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{11,ij} &= (\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_j \partial x_i} - \Gamma_{ji}^k \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}) (v_{11}) = \frac{\partial^2(v_{11})}{\partial x_j \partial x_i} - \Gamma_{ji}^k v_{11,k} \\
&= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_j \partial x_i} (\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x_1 \partial x_1} - \Gamma_{11}^l v_l) - \Gamma_{ji}^k v_{11,k} \\
&= \frac{\partial^4 v}{\partial x_j \partial x_i \partial x_1 \partial x_1} - \Gamma_{11}^l v_{l,ij} - \frac{\partial(\Gamma_{11}^l)}{\partial x_j} v_{l,i} - \frac{\partial(\Gamma_{11}^l)}{\partial x_i} v_{l,j} \\
&\quad - \frac{\partial^2(\Gamma_{11}^l)}{\partial x_j \partial x_i} v_l - \Gamma_{ji}^k v_{11,k} \\
&= v_{ij,11} + \Gamma_{ji}^l \Gamma_{11}^k v_{k,l} + \frac{\partial \Gamma_{11}^k}{\partial x_l} \Gamma_{ji}^l v_k + 2 \frac{\partial(\Gamma_{ji}^l)}{\partial x_1} v_{l,1} + \frac{\partial^2(\Gamma_{ji}^l)}{\partial x_1 \partial x_1} v_l \\
&\quad + \Gamma_{11}^l \Gamma_{ji}^k v_{k,l} + \frac{\partial \Gamma_{ji}^k}{\partial x_l} \Gamma_{11}^l v_k - \frac{\partial(\Gamma_{11}^l)}{\partial x_j} v_{l,i} - \frac{\partial(\Gamma_{11}^l)}{\partial x_i} v_{l,j} - \frac{\partial^2(\Gamma_{11}^l)}{\partial x_j \partial x_i} v_l
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Substitute (55) and (56) into (52). At x_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \rho^{-1} e^{-\beta_0 d_0} \bar{L}^{ij} \tilde{H}_{ij}(x_0) \\
&\geq \bar{L}^{ij} \left(v_{ij,11} + 2a(1 + \psi\beta e^v)^2 v_{k,j} v_{k,i} + 2a(1 + \psi\beta e^v)(v_k + \gamma_k) v_{ij,k} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - s_0 v_{ij,\nu} \right) - C_2 \rho^{-1} \sum_l F^{ll} |v_{k,i}|
\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

Differentiate the equation $F(\bar{W}_{ij} g^{jr}) = \phi e^{2v}$ along the x_l -th direction.

$$\begin{aligned}
(\phi e^{2v})_l &= F^{ir} \left(g^{jr} \bar{W}_{ij,l} + \bar{W}_{ij} g_l^{jr} \right) \\
&= F^{ir} g^{jr} (v_{ij,l} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g v)_l g_{ij}) + F^{ir} g^{jr} \left(\frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g v) g_{ij,l} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (2-t) v_m v_{k,l} g^{km} g_{ij} + \frac{2-t}{2} v_k v_m g_l^{km} g_{ij} + \frac{2-t}{2} |\nabla v|_g^2 g_{ij,l} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - v_{i,l} v_j - v_{j,l} v_i - (A_g^t)_{ij,l} \right) + F^{ir} g_l^{jr} \bar{W}_{ij},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that, at x_0 , by $g_{ij} = \delta_{ij}$

$$|F^{ij} v_{ij,l} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g v)_l \sum_i F^{ii}| \leq C_1 \sum_{i,j,r} F^{rr} |v_{i,j}|, \tag{58}$$

where we used $|\Delta_g v|(x_0) = |\sum_k v_{kk}| \leq C_1 \sum_{k,m} |v_{k,m}|$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
|\bar{W}_{ij}(x_0)| &= |v_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g v) g_{ij} + \frac{2-t}{2} |\nabla v|_g^2 g_{ij} - v_i v_j - (A_g^t)_{ij}| \\
&\leq C_1 \sum_{k,m} |v_{k,m}|.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall the Laplace-Beltrami operator $\Delta_g = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_m})$.

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Delta_g v)_l &= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km} v_m) \right)_l \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km}) v_{m,k} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k v_m \right)_l \\
&= g^{km} v_{m,k,l} + g_{,l}^{km} v_{m,k} + \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k \right)_l v_m + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k v_{m,l} \\
&= g^{km} (v_{mk} + \Gamma_{km}^s v_s)_l + g_{,l}^{km} v_{m,k} + \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k \right)_l v_m \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k v_{m,l} \\
&= g^{km} v_{mk,l} + g^{km} \Gamma_{km}^s v_{s,l} + g^{km} \frac{\partial \Gamma_{km}^s}{\partial x_l} v_s + g_{,l}^{km} v_{m,k} \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k \right)_l v_m + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k v_{m,l}.
\end{aligned}$$

Substitute the above identity into (58). At x_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
C_1 \sum_{i,j,r} F^{rr} |v_{i,j}| &\geq |F^{ij} v_{ij,l} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} g^{km} v_{mk,l} \sum_i F^{ii}| \\
&= |F^{ij} v_{ij,l} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} \sum_{i,k} F^{ii} v_{kk,l}| \\
&= |\bar{L}^{ij} v_{ij,l}|
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

Differentiate the equation $F(\bar{W}_l g^{lj}) = \phi e^{2v}$ along the x_1 -th direction twice and evaluate it at x_0 .

$$\begin{aligned}
F^{ij}(\bar{W}_{il} g^{lj})_{11} + F^{ij,rs}(\bar{W}_{il} g^{lj})_1(\bar{W}_{rk} g^{ks})_1 &= e^{2v}(\phi_{11} + 4\phi v_1^2 + 4\phi_1 v_1 + 2\phi v_{11}) \\
&\geq e^{2v}(\phi_{11} + 4\phi v_1^2 + 4\phi_1 v_1)
\end{aligned}$$

since we have already assumed $v_{1,1}(x_0) \gg 1$.

By the concavity of f in Γ , we have $F^{ij,rs}(\bar{W}_{il} g^{lj})_1(\bar{W}_{rk} g^{ks})_1 < 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
-C_1 &\leq F^{ij}(\bar{W}_{il} g^{lj})_{11}(x_0) \\
&= F^{ij}(\bar{W}_{ij,11} + 2\bar{W}_{il,1} g_{,1}^{lj} + \bar{W}_{ij} g_{,11}^{lj}) \\
&= F^{ij}(\bar{W}_{ij,11} + \bar{W}_{ij} g_{,11}^{lj}) \quad \text{by (50)} \\
&\leq F^{ij} \bar{W}_{ij,11} + C_1 \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} |v_{j,k}| \\
&= F^{ij} \left(v_{ij,11} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g v)_{11} \delta_{ij} + \frac{2(1-t)}{n-2} (\Delta_g v)_1 g_{ij,1} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g v) g_{ij,11} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (2-t) v_{k,1}^2 \delta_{ij} + (2-t) v_k v_{k,11} \delta_{ij} + 2(2-t) v_k v_{l,1} g_{,1}^{kl} \delta_{ij} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{2-t}{2} v_k v_l g_{,11}^{kl} \delta_{ij} + \frac{2-t}{2} |\nabla v|_g^2 g_{ij,11} - 2v_{i,1} v_{j,1} - 2v_i v_{j,11} - (A_g^t)_{ij,11} \right) \\
&\quad + C_1 \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} |v_{j,k}| \\
&= F^{ij} \left(v_{ij,11} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g v)_{11} \delta_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g v) g_{ij,11} + (2-t) v_{k,1}^2 \delta_{ij} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (2-t) v_k v_{k,11} \delta_{ij} + \frac{2-t}{2} v_k v_l g_{,11}^{kl} \delta_{ij} + \frac{2-t}{2} |\nabla v|_g^2 g_{ij,11} - 2v_{i,1} v_{j,1} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2v_i v_{j,11} - (A_g^t)_{ij,11} \right) + C_1 \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} |v_{j,k}|, \quad \text{by (49) and (50)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus at x_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
-C_1 \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} |v_{j,k}| &\leq F^{ij} \left(v_{ij,11} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g v)_{11} \delta_{ij} + (2-t) v_k v_{k,11} \delta_{ij} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2v_i v_{j,11} + (2-t) v_{k,1}^2 \delta_{ij} - 2v_{i,1} v_{j,1} \right) \\
&\leq F^{ij} \left(v_{ij,11} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g v)_{11} \delta_{ij} + (2-t) v_k v_{11,k} \delta_{ij} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 2v_i v_{11,j} + (2-t) v_{k,1}^2 \delta_{ij} - 2v_{i,1} v_{j,1} \right) \\
&\quad + C_1 \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} |v_{j,k}| \quad \text{by (55)} \\
&\leq F^{ij} \left(v_{ij,11} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g v)_{11} \delta_{ij} + (2-t) v_{k,1}^2 \delta_{ij} - 2v_{i,1} v_{j,1} \right) \\
&\quad + C_2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} |v_{j,k}| \quad \text{by (53)}
\end{aligned}$$

i.e., at x_0

$$\begin{aligned} F^{ij} \left(v_{ij,11} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta_g v)_{11} \delta_{ij} \right) &\geq -(2-t) \sum_{k,i} F^{ii} v_{k,1}^2 + 2F^{ij} v_{i,1} v_{j,1} \\ -C_2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} |v_{j,k}| &\geq -C_1 \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} v_{j,k}^2 - C_2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} |v_{j,k}| \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

For the term $(\Delta_g v)_{11}$ in the above inequality, we need to replace it by $\sum_k v_{kk,11}$. For this reason, recall $\Delta_g = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_m})$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta_g v)_{11}(x_0) &= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km} v_m) \right)_{11} \\ &= \left(g^{km} v_{m,k} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k v_m \right)_{11} \\ &= \left(g^{km} (v_{mk} + \Gamma_{km}^l v_l) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k v_m \right)_{11} \\ &= \left(g^{km} v_{mk} + g^{km} \Gamma_{km}^l v_l + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k v_m \right)_{11} \\ &= g^{km} v_{mk,11} + 2g_{,1}^{km} v_{mk,1} + g_{,11}^{km} v_{mk} + g^{km} \Gamma_{km}^l v_{l,11} \\ &\quad + 2(g^{km} \Gamma_{km}^l)_{,1} v_{l,1} + (g^{km} \Gamma_{km}^l)_{11} v_l + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k v_{m,11} \\ &\quad + 2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k\right)_{,1} v_{m,1} + \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k\right)_{11} v_m \\ &= v_{kk,11} + g_{,11}^{km} v_{mk} + \Gamma_{kk}^l v_{l,11} + 2(g^{km} \Gamma_{km}^l)_{,1} v_{l,1} \\ &\quad + (g^{km} \Gamma_{km}^l)_{11} v_l + (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k v_{m,11} + 2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k\right)_{,1} v_{m,1} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k\right)_{11} v_m \quad \text{by (50)}. \end{aligned}$$

Plug the above equation into (60). At x_0 ,

$$-C_1 \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} v_{j,k}^2 - C_2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} |v_{j,k}| \leq$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& F^{ij} \left(v_{ij,11} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} v_{kk,11} \delta_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} \Gamma_{kk}^l v_{l,11} \delta_{ij} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k v_{m,11} \delta_{ij} \right) + C_1 \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} |v_{j,k}| \\
& \leq F^{ij} \left(v_{ij,11} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} v_{kk,11} \delta_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} \Gamma_{kk}^l v_{11,l} \delta_{ij} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\sqrt{|g|} g^{km})_k v_{11,m} \delta_{ij} \right) + C_1 \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} |v_{j,k}| \quad \text{by (55)} \\
& \leq F^{ij} \left(v_{ij,11} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} v_{kk,11} \delta_{ij} \right) + C_2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} |v_{j,k}| \quad \text{by (53)} \\
& = \bar{L}^{ij} v_{ij,11} + C_2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} |v_{j,k}|,
\end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\bar{L}^{ij} v_{ij,11}(x_0) \geq -C_1 \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} v_{j,k}^2 - C_2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \sum_{i,j,k} F^{ii} |v_{j,k}| \quad (61)$$

Substitute (59) and (61) into (57). Notice that $v_{ij,\nu} = -v_{ij,n}$ and $1 + \psi\beta e^v \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. At x_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 & \geq 2a(1 + \psi\beta e^v)^2 \bar{L}^{ij} v_{k,j} v_{k,i} - C_2 \rho^{-1} \sum_{l,k,i} F^{ll} |v_{k,i}| - C_1 \sum_{l,k,i} F^{ll} v_{k,i}^2 \\
& \geq \frac{a}{2} \bar{L}^{ij} v_{k,j} v_{k,i} - C_2 \rho^{-1} \sum_{l,k,i} F^{ll} |v_{k,i}| - C_1 \sum_{l,k,i} F^{ll} v_{k,i}^2 \\
& \geq \frac{a(1-t)}{2(n-2)} \sum_l F^{ll} v_{k,i}^2 - C_2 \rho^{-1} \sum_{l,k,i} F^{ll} |v_{k,i}| - C_1 \sum_{l,k,i} F^{ll} v_{k,i}^2 \\
& \geq \sum_{l,k,i} F^{ll} v_{k,i}^2 - C_2 \rho^{-1} \sum_{l,k,i} F^{ll} |v_{k,i}| \quad \text{by taking } a > \frac{2(n-2)(C_1+1)}{(1-t)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Multiply the above inequality by ρ^2 . At x_0 ,

$$0 \geq \sum_{l,k,i} F^{ll} \left((\rho v_{k,i})^2 - C_2 \rho |v_{k,i}| \right),$$

which implies that $(\rho |v_{1,1}|)(x_0) < C_2$, therefore $H(x_0) < C_2$. Lemma 6.1 has been established. ♣.

Remark 6.1 As a consequence of the Lemma 6.1, $\forall y \in B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0})$, let $(e_1, \dots, e_n)$ be an orthonormal basis of $T_y M$ with $e_n = \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$, and let subindices denote the covariant

derivatives w.r.t. e_j . By $\Gamma \subset \Gamma_1$, we have $\Delta_g v(y) > -C$, which implies that $v_{\nu\nu}(y) > -C$, and for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$,

$$v_{kk}(y) = \Delta_g v - \sum_{l \neq k, n} v_{ll} - v_{nn} \geq -C - v_{nn} = -C - v_{\nu\nu}.$$

If $v_{\nu\nu}(y) \geq 0$, then $v_{\nu\nu} + C \geq C > v_{kk}(y) > -C - v_{\nu\nu}$ implies that $|v_{kk}(y)| \leq C + v_{\nu\nu}(y)$ for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$. If $v_{\nu\nu}(y) < 0$, then $C > v_{kk}(y) > -C - v_{\nu\nu} > -C$ implies that $|v_{kk}(y)| \leq C \leq C + v_{\nu\nu}(y)$ for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ since $v_{\nu\nu}(y) \geq -C$. Hence, for any two vectors $X, Y \in T_y M$ with $g(X, \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}) = g(Y, \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_g^2 v(X, Y)|(y) &= |\frac{1}{2}(\nabla_g^2 v(X+Y, X+Y) - \nabla_g^2 v(X, X) - \nabla_g^2 v(Y, Y))| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(|\nabla_g^2 v(X+Y, X+Y)| + |\nabla_g^2 v(X, X)| + |\nabla_g^2 v(Y, Y)|) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(|X+Y|_g^2 + |X|_g^2 + |Y|_g^2)(v_{\nu\nu} + C) \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2}(|X|_g^2 + |Y|_g^2)(v_{\nu\nu} + C) \leq 2(|X|_g^2 + |Y|_g^2)(v_{\nu\nu} + C) \\ &\leq (|X|_g^2 + |Y|_g^2)(2v_{\nu\nu} + C). \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Lemma 6.2 *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.2, for $t < 1$, let v be a C^4 solution of the equation (12). Then there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ depending only on (M^n, g, t) , (f, Γ) , ϕ , ψ , $\delta_{y^{i_0}}$ such that in $B_{\frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{64}}^T(y^{i_0}) \cap \partial M$,*

$$v_{\nu\nu} < C.$$

Proof of the Lemma 6.2. Let $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ be the tubular neighborhood normal coordinates of $y \in B_{\frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0})$ at y^{i_0} . Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be a smooth orthonormal frame of TM in $B_{\frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0})$ with $e_n = \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$. In fact, we can obtain such frame by moving an orthonormal basis of $T_{y^{i_0}}(\partial M)$ parallelly along the geodesic of $(\partial M, g|_{\partial M})$ to get an orthonormal frame of $T(\partial M)$ in $B_{\frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0})$, then moving such frame parallelly along the geodesic $r(t) = E(\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}, t)$. In this way, we can get smooth orthonormal vector fields $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^{n-1}$ in $B_{\frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0})$ with $g(e_j, \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}) = 0$, and $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^n$ with $e_n = \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ will be an orthonormal frame of TM in $B_{\frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0})$.

Observe $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ is the unit tangent vector of the geodesic. We have

$$\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} = 0 \quad \text{in } B_{\frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0}). \tag{63}$$

In the following, subindices denote the covariant derivatives w.r.t. $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$. Differentiate the equation $F(\bar{W}_{ij}) = \phi e^{2v}$ along the normal direction e_n ,

$$F^{ij} \left(v_{ij,\nu} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} (\Delta v)_\nu \delta_{ij} + (2-t) v_k v_{k,\nu} \delta_{ij} - 2v_i v_{j,\nu} - (A_g^t)_{ij,\nu} \right) = e^{2v} (\phi_\nu + 2\phi v_\nu) \quad (64)$$

We need to interchange $v_{ij,\nu}$ to $v_{\nu,ij}$. For this reason, let $e_i = a_i^j \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}$. Then $a_i^j \in C^\infty(B_{\delta_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{32}}}^T(y^{i_0}))$, and

$$g(e_i, e_j) = \delta_{ij} \iff a_i^k g_{kl} a_j^l = \delta_{ij}. \quad (65)$$

Notice $e_n = \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}$ and $g(e_i, e_n) = \delta_{in}$. We have

$$a_n^k = -\delta_n^k, \quad a_i^n = -\delta_i^n. \quad (66)$$

In $B_{\delta_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{32}}}^T(y^{i_0})$,

$$\begin{aligned} v_{i,\nu} &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial y_n} (a_i^r \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_r}) = -a_i^r \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y_n \partial y_r} - \frac{\partial a_i^r}{\partial y_n} \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_r}. \\ v_{\nu,ij} &= (\nabla^2 v)_\nu (e_i, e_j) = a_i^r a_j^s (\nabla^2 v)_\nu (\frac{\partial}{\partial y_r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_s}) \\ &= a_i^r a_j^s (\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_s \partial y_r} - \Gamma_{sr}^l \frac{\partial}{\partial y_l}) (-\frac{\partial v}{\partial y_n}) \\ &= -a_i^r a_j^s \frac{\partial^3 v}{\partial y_s \partial y_r \partial y_n} + a_i^r a_j^s \Gamma_{sr}^l \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y_l \partial y_n}, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} v_{ij,\nu} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} (\nabla^2 v(e_i, e_j)) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial y_n} (a_i^r a_j^s \nabla^2 v(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_s})) \\ &= -a_i^r a_j^s \frac{\partial}{\partial y_n} (\nabla^2 v(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_s})) - \frac{\partial(a_i^r a_j^s)}{\partial y_n} (\nabla^2 v(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_s})) \\ &= -a_i^r a_j^s \frac{\partial}{\partial y_n} (\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y^s \partial y^r} - \Gamma_{sr}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l}) - \frac{\partial(a_i^r a_j^s)}{\partial y_n} (\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y^s \partial y^r} - \Gamma_{sr}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l}) \\ &= -a_i^r a_j^s \frac{\partial^3 v}{\partial y_n \partial y_s \partial y_r} + a_i^r a_j^s \Gamma_{sr}^l \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y_n \partial y_l} + a_i^r a_j^s \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l} \frac{\partial \Gamma_{sr}^l}{\partial y_n} \\ &\quad - \frac{\partial(a_i^r a_j^s)}{\partial y_n} \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y_s \partial y_r} + \frac{\partial(a_i^r a_j^s)}{\partial y_n} \Gamma_{sr}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l} \\ &= v_{\nu,ij} + a_i^r a_j^s \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l} \frac{\partial \Gamma_{sr}^l}{\partial y_n} - \frac{\partial(a_i^r a_j^s)}{\partial y_n} \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y_s \partial y_r} + \frac{\partial(a_i^r a_j^s)}{\partial y_n} \Gamma_{sr}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l} \\ &:= v_{\nu,ij} + \Omega_{ij}^{rs} \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y_r \partial y_s} + \Theta_{ij}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l}, \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

where

$$\Omega_{ij}^{rs} = -\frac{\partial(a_i^r a_j^s)}{\partial y_n}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_{ij}^l = a_i^r a_j^s \frac{\partial \Gamma_{sr}^l}{\partial y_n} + \frac{\partial(a_i^r a_j^s)}{\partial y_n} \Gamma_{sr}^l,$$

depend only on (M^n, g) , and are smooth and bounded in $B_{\delta_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{32}}}^T(y^{i_0})$.

In particular,

$$(\Delta v)_\nu = \Delta(v_\nu) + \Omega_{kk}^{rs} \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y_r \partial y_s} + \Theta_{kk}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l}. \quad (69)$$

Substitute (67), (68), and (69) into (64). We have

$$\begin{aligned} & F^{ij} \left\{ v_{\nu,ij} + \Omega_{ij}^{rs} \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y_r \partial y_s} + \Theta_{ij}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} \Delta(v_\nu) \delta_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} \Omega_{kk}^{rs} \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y_r \partial y_s} \delta_{ij} \right. \\ & + \frac{1-t}{n-2} \Theta_{kk}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l} \delta_{ij} + (2-t) v_k \left(-a_k^r \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y_n \partial y_r} - \frac{\partial a_k^r}{\partial y_n} \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_r} \right) \delta_{ij} \\ & \left. - 2v_i \left(-a_j^r \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y_n \partial y_r} - \frac{\partial a_j^r}{\partial y_n} \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_r} \right) - (A_g^t)_{ij,\nu} \right\} \\ & = e^{2v} (\phi_\nu + 2\phi v_\nu), \end{aligned}$$

which can be written as

$$L^{ij}(v_\nu)_{ij} + \Lambda^{rs} \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y_r \partial y_s} = \Pi, \quad (70)$$

where

$$L^{ij} = F^{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} \sum_l F^{ll} \delta^{ij},$$

$$\Lambda^{rs} = F^{ij} \left\{ \Omega_{ij}^{rs} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} \Omega_{kk}^{rs} \delta_{ij} - (2-t) v_k a_k^r \delta_{ij} \delta^{sn} + 2v_i a_j^r \delta^{sn} \right\},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi &= e^{2v} (\phi_\nu + 2\phi v_\nu) - F^{ij} \left\{ \Theta_{ij}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} \Theta_{kk}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l} \delta_{ij} \right. \\ & \left. - (2-t) \frac{\partial a_k^r}{\partial y_n} \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_r} v_k \delta_{ij} + 2 \frac{\partial a_j^r}{\partial y_n} \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_r} v_i - (A_g^t)_{ij,\nu} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

depend only on (M^n, g) , $|\nabla v|_{C^1(M, g)}$, t , and ϕ , and are C^3 and bounded by $C \sum_l F^{ll}$.

For $\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y_r \partial y_s}$, we need to replace it by the partial derivatives of v w.r.t. e_i . Recall that $e_i = a_i^j \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}$. Hence $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} = b_i^j e_j$ with $(b_i^j) = (a_i^j)^{-1}$, which is also smooth in $B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0})$. In $B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y_r \partial y_s} &= \nabla^2 v \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_s}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_r} \right) + \Gamma_{rs}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l} = b_s^i b_r^j \nabla^2 v(e_i, e_j) + \Gamma_{rs}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l} \\ &= b_s^i b_r^j v_{ij} + \Gamma_{rs}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l}, \end{aligned}$$

therefore (70) implies that

$$L^{ij}(v_\nu)_{ij} + \Lambda^{rs} b_s^i b_r^j v_{ij} = \Pi - \Lambda^{rs} \Gamma_{rs}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l},$$

or

$$L^{ij}(v_\nu)_{ij} + \sum_{j=1}^n \Lambda^{rs} b_s^i b_r^j v_{\nu j} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Lambda^{rs} b_s^i b_r^n v_{i\nu} = \Pi - \Lambda^{rs} \Gamma_{rs}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial y_l} - \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \Lambda^{rs} b_s^i b_r^j v_{ij}. \quad (71)$$

By

$$v_{\nu j} = (\nabla_{e_j} \nabla_\nu)(v) - (\nabla_{e_j}^\nu)(v) = v_{\nu, j} - (\nabla_{e_j}^\nu)(v),$$

and

$$v_{i\nu} = v_{\nu i} = v_{\nu, i} - (\nabla_{e_i}^\nu)(v),$$

(71) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} L^{ij}(v_\nu)_{ij} + \sum_{j=1}^n \Lambda^{rs} b_s^n b_r^j v_{\nu, j} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Lambda^{rs} b_s^i b_r^n v_{\nu, i} &= \Pi - \Lambda^{rs} \Gamma_{rs}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_l} \\ + \sum_{j=1}^n \Lambda^{rs} b_s^n b_r^j (\nabla_{e_j}^\nu)(v) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Lambda^{rs} b_s^i b_r^n (\nabla_{e_i}^\nu)(v) - \sum_{i, j=1}^{n-1} \Lambda^{rs} b_s^i b_r^j v_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

Define an elliptic 2nd order linear differential operator in $B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0})$ as follows.

$$L(w) = L^{ij} w_{ij} + (b^i - \bar{s} \sum_l F^{ll} \delta^{ni}) w_i,$$

where $b^i = \begin{cases} \Lambda^{rs} b_s^n b_r^i + \Lambda^{rs} b_s^i b_r^n & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq n-1 \\ \Lambda^{rs} b_s^n b_r^n & \text{if } i = n, \end{cases}$ and $\bar{s} > 0$ is some constant to be determined later. Then $|b^i| \leq C \sum_l F^{ll}$ in $B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0})$, and

$$\begin{aligned} L(v_\nu) &= \Pi - \Lambda^{rs} \Gamma_{rs}^l \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_l} + \sum_{j=1}^n \Lambda^{rs} b_s^n b_r^j (\nabla_{e_j}^\nu)(v) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Lambda^{rs} b_s^i b_r^n (\nabla_{e_i}^\nu)(v) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i, j=1}^{n-1} \Lambda^{rs} b_s^i b_r^j v_{ij} - \bar{s} \sum_l F^{ll} v_{\nu, n} \\ &\leq C \sum_l F^{ll} - \sum_{i, j=1}^{n-1} \Lambda^{rs} b_s^i b_r^j v_{ij} - \bar{s} \sum_l F^{ll} v_{\nu, \nu} \\ &\leq C \sum_l F^{ll} + C \sum_l F^{ll} \sum_{i, j=1}^{n-1} |v_{ij}| - \bar{s} \sum_l F^{ll} (v_{\nu\nu} + (\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}}^\nu) v) \\ &\leq C \sum_l F^{ll} + C \sum_l F^{ll} \sum_{i, j=1}^{n-1} |v_{ij}| - \bar{s} \sum_l F^{ll} v_{\nu\nu} \quad \text{by (63)} \\ &\leq C \sum_l F^{ll} + C \sum_l F^{ll} \sum_{i, j=1}^{n-1} 2(2v_{\nu\nu} + C) - \bar{s} \sum_l F^{ll} v_{\nu\nu} \quad \text{by (62)} \\ &\leq C \sum_l F^{ll} + C \sum_l F^{ll} v_{\nu\nu} - \bar{s} \sum_l F^{ll} v_{\nu\nu} \\ &= C \sum_l F^{ll} - (\bar{s} - C) \sum_l F^{ll} v_{\nu\nu} \\ &\leq C \sum_l F^{ll} \quad \text{by taking } \bar{s} > C, \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

where, in the last inequality, we used $v_{\nu\nu} > -C$, therefore $-v_{\nu\nu} < C$.

From the equation $F(\bar{W}) = \phi e^{2v}$, we know

$$L^{ij}v_{ij} = \phi e^{2v} + F^{ij}v_i v_j - \frac{2-t}{2} |\nabla v|_g^2 \sum_l F^{ll} + F^{ij}(A_g^t)_{ij},$$

hence

$$|L(v)| \leq C \sum_l F^{ll} \quad \text{in } B_{\frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0}). \quad (73)$$

For any $y_0 \in B_{\frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{64}}^T(y^{i_0}) \cap \partial M$, let $(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, 0)$ be the tubular neighborhood normal coordinates of y_0 at y^{i_0} , and let

$$D := \{(y_1, \dots, y_n) \mid y_n \geq 0, \sqrt{(y_1 - a_1)^2 + \dots + (y_{n-1} - a_{n-1})^2 + y_n^2} < \frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{64}\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{y_1^2 + \dots + y_n^2} &\leq \sqrt{a_1^2 + \dots + a_{n-1}^2} + \sqrt{(y_1 - a_1)^2 + \dots + (y_{n-1} - a_{n-1})^2 + y_n^2} \\ &< \frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{64} + \frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{64} = \frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{32}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $D \subset B_{\frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0})$.

Extend h_g, ψ to a smooth and $C^{3,\alpha}$ function in $B_{\frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0})$ independently, still denoted by h_g, ψ . In D , consider

$$\bar{w} = v_\nu - \psi e^v + h_g + a(1 - e^{-by_n}) + \bar{c}((y_1 - a_1)^2 + \dots + (y_{n-1} - a_{n-1})^2 + y_n^2),$$

where $a, b, \bar{c}$ are positive constants to be determined later.

Pick $\bar{c} > 0$ such that

$$v_\nu - \psi e^v + h_g + \bar{c}\left(\frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{64}\right)^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{in } B_{\frac{\delta_{y^{i_0}}}{32}}^T(y^{i_0}).$$

Then

$$\bar{w}(x_0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{w} \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \partial D. \quad (74)$$

Denote $\mathcal{R} = (y_1 - a_1)^2 + \dots + (y_{n-1} - a_{n-1})^2 + y_n^2$. By (73),

$$\begin{aligned} |L(-\psi e^v + h_g + \bar{c}\mathcal{R})| &= |L(h_g + \bar{c}\mathcal{R}) - \psi e^v L(v) - e^v L(\psi) \\ &\quad - 2L^{ij}\psi_i v_j - \psi e^v L^{ij}v_i v_j| \leq C \sum_l F^{ll}. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

To estimate $L(e^{-by_n})$, recall $e_i = a_i^j \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}$. In D ,

$$|b^i(e^{-by_n})_i| = |b^i a_i^j \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}(e^{-by_n})| = |-bb^i a_i^j e^{-by_n} \delta_{jn}| \leq Cbe^{-by_n} \sum_l F^{ll},$$

where and in the following, $C > 0$ denotes a universal constants independent of a and b .

$$\begin{aligned} L^{ij}(e^{-by_n})_{ij} &= L^{ij}(\nabla^2(e^{-by_n})(e_i, e_j)) = a_i^r a_j^s L^{ij}(\nabla^2(e^{-by_n})(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_s})) \\ &= a_i^r a_j^s L^{ij}(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_s \partial y_r}(e^{-by_n}) - \Gamma_{sr}^l \frac{\partial}{\partial y_l}(e^{-by_n})) \\ &= a_i^r a_j^s L^{ij}(b^2 e^{-by_n} \delta_{rn} \delta_{sn} + be^{-by_n} \Gamma_{sr}^l \delta_{nl}) \\ &= b^2 e^{-by_n} L^{ij} a_i^n a_j^n + be^{-by_n} \Gamma_{sr}^n L^{ij} a_i^r a_j^s \\ &\geq b^2 e^{-by_n} L^{ij} a_i^n a_j^n - Cbe^{-by_n} \sum_l F^{ll} \\ &\geq b^2 e^{-by_n} a_i^n a_j^n (F^{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} \sum_l F^{ll} \delta_{ij}) - Cbe^{-by_n} \sum_l F^{ll} \\ &\geq \frac{1-t}{n-2} b^2 e^{-by_n} (a_i^n)^2 \sum_l F^{ll} - Cbe^{-by_n} \sum_l F^{ll} \\ &= \frac{1-t}{n-2} b^2 e^{-by_n} \sum_l F^{ll} - Cbe^{-by_n} \sum_l F^{ll} \quad \text{by (66).} \end{aligned}$$

Thus in D ,

$$\begin{aligned} L(e^{-by_n}) &\geq \frac{1-t}{n-2} b^2 e^{-by_n} \sum_l F^{ll} - Cbe^{-by_n} \sum_l F^{ll} \\ &\geq be^{-by_n} \left(\frac{(1-t)b}{n-2} - C \right) \sum_l F^{ll} \\ &\geq be^{-by_n} \sum_l F^{ll}, \end{aligned}$$

by choosing $b \gg 1$ such that $\frac{(1-t)b}{n-2} - C \geq 1$.

Back to $L(\bar{w})$, we have in D ,

$$\begin{aligned} L(\bar{w}) &= L(v_\nu - \psi e^v + h_g + c\mathcal{R}) - aL(e^{-by_n}) \\ &\leq -abe^{-by_n} \sum_l F^{ll} + C \sum_l F^{ll} \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

by choosing $a \gg 1$ such that $abe^{-\frac{b\delta}{64}y^i} > C$.

Hence (74) implies that

$$\bar{w} \geq 0 \quad \text{in } D,$$

therefore we have $\bar{w}_\nu(y_0) \leq 0$, i.e., $v_{\nu\nu}(y_0) < C$. Since $y_0 \in B_{\frac{\delta}{64}}^T(y^{i_0}) \cap \partial M$ is arbitrary, Lemma 6.2 has been established. ♣

Remark 6.2 By the Lemma 6.1 and the Lemma 6.2 and $\cup_{i_0=1}^N (B_{\frac{y^{i_0}}{64}}^T(y^{i_0}) \cap \partial M) = \partial M$, we know the Hessian of v on ∂M is upper bounded w.r.t. the metric g . Thus $\Gamma \subset \Gamma_1$ implies that

$$|\nabla_g^2 v|_g \leq C \quad \text{on } \partial M.$$

Lemma 6.3 Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.2, for $t < 1$, let v be a C^4 solution of the equation (12). Then there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ depending only on (M^n, g, t) , (f, Γ) , ϕ , ψ such that on M ,

$$|\nabla^2 v| < C.$$

Proof of the Lemma 6.3. Consider

$$E(x) = \max_{e \in T_x M, g(e,e)=1} (\nabla^2 v + a|\nabla v|_g^2 g)(e, e).$$

Let $E(x_0) = \max_M E$, and let $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$ be a geodesic normal coordinates w.r.t. the metric g at x_0 . In the following, subindices denote the covariant derivatives w.r.t. $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$. W.l.o.g, we assume x_0 is an interior point of M , and $E(x_0) = v_{11} + a|\nabla v|_g^2$. Consider $\bar{E} = \frac{v_{11}}{g_{11}} + a|\nabla v|_g^2$. Then x_0 is a local maximum point of $\bar{E}$. We can proceed as in the proof of the Lemma 6.1 to finish the proof of the Lemma 6.3. ♣

7 Proof of the Theorem 1.2

Consider the homotopy equation H_s , for $0 \leq s \leq 1$,

$$\begin{cases} f(-\lambda_g(s\bar{W} + (1-s)\sigma_1(\bar{W})g)) - s\phi e^{2v} - (1-s)e^{2v} = 0 & \text{on } M, \\ v_\nu + h_g - se^v\psi = 0 & \text{on } \partial M, \end{cases} \quad (76)$$

where $\bar{W} = W_g^v - A_g^t$.

By the uniform C^2 estimates we established and the result of Lieberman and Trudinger ([19]), we have the uniform C^{2,α_0} bounds for the solutions of the above equation. C^{4,α_0} estimates follow from the Schauder estimates. By the direct computation, the linearized operator $\mathcal{L}_s(w)$ at a solution v is given by

$$\begin{cases} (sL^{ij} + (1-s)L^l\delta_{ij})w_{ij} + \bar{b}^i w_i - 2(s\phi + (1-s))e^{2v}w & \text{on } M, \\ w_\nu - s\psi e^v w & \text{on } \partial M, \end{cases} \quad (77)$$

where

$$\bar{b}^i = s(2-t)F^{ll}v_i - 2sF^{ij}v_j + (2n-nt-2)(1-s)F^{ll}v_i.$$

By $\phi > 0$ $\psi \leq 0$ and the maximum principle, the linearized operator is an elliptic invertible operator: $C^{2,\alpha} \rightarrow C^\alpha$. Hence the equation of (76) for $s = 1$ is uniquely solvable in C^{4,α_0} if and only if the equation of (76) for $s = 0$ is uniquely solvable in C^{4,α_0} . When $s = 0$, the uniqueness and the existence of the solution has been confirmed in [3]. ♣

8 Proof of the Theorem 1.3

Take an arbitrary Riemannian metric g on M^n . For instance, let $\{U_i, x_j^{(i)}\}_{i=1, j=1}^{N, n}$ be a finite coordinate charts on M^n and let ϕ^i be a partition of unity subordinate to U_i . We can simply take g to be $\sum_{i=1}^N \phi^i((dx_1^{(i)})^2 + \cdots + (dx_n^{(i)})^2)$. Let $w(x)$ be a smooth function on M^n such that $w(x)$ is the distance of x to ∂M w.r.t. the metric g when x is near ∂M . Then $\frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu}|_{\partial M} = -1$, where $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ is the unit outer normal of g on ∂M . Extend the mean curvature h_g to a smooth function defined on M^n , still denoted by h_g . We can obtain such extension by straightening the boundary and extending any function $\bar{\psi}$ defined on ∂R_+^n to R_+^n using $\bar{\psi}(x')(1-x_n)$, where $x = (x', x_n) \in R_+^n$. However, we want to mention a different way which seems more natural. In fact, we only need to extend h_g smoothly to the interior of M near ∂M . Using the partition of unity, we can localize the extension to a small neighborhood of each $x_0 \in \partial M$. Notice h_g is the trace of the second fundamental form of g on ∂M whose definition is, at every point $x \in \partial M$,

$$II(X, Y) = -g(\nabla_X^{\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}}, Y), \quad \forall X, Y \in T_x(\partial M).$$

Let U be a small neighborhood where the tubular neighborhood normal coordinates of $x \in U$ at x_0 is smooth and well-defined. Let $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$ be such coordinates. Then $-\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}$ is a smooth extension of $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}$ to U and $g(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}) = 0$ in U for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, so

$$\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} g(\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}}^{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}) g^{ij} \quad (78)$$

is an extension of h_g to U , where (g^{ij}) is the inverse of $(g_{ij}) = (g(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}))$. From the linear algebra, we know $(g^{ij}) = \frac{1}{\det(g_{ij})} \text{adj}(g_{ij})$, hence g^{ij} is smooth and (78) gives a smooth extension of h_g to U .

Let $v = h_g w$. Consider $g_1 = e^{2v} g$. Then on ∂M ,

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{g_1} &= \left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} + h_g\right)e^{-v} = \left(h_g \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} + w \frac{\partial h_g}{\partial \nu} + h_g\right)e^{-v} \\
&= (h_g(-1) + (0) \frac{\partial h_g}{\partial \nu} + h_g) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

For g_1 , let w_1 be a smooth function such that, near ∂M , w_1 is the distance function to ∂M w.r.t. g_1 . We know that $\frac{\partial w_1}{\partial \nu_1}|_{\partial M} = -1$, where $\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu_1}$ is the unit outer normal of g_1 on ∂M . Take $g_2 = e^{2A(w_1)^2} g_1$ with $A > 0$ being a constant to be chosen later.

Direct computations yield that on ∂M

$$h_{g_2} = (2Aw_1 \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial \nu_1} + h_{g_1})e^{A(w_1)^2} = 0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
Ric_{g_2} &= Ric_{g_1} - (n-2)A\nabla_{g_1}^2(w_1^2) - A(\Delta_{g_1}(w_1^2))g_1 + (n-2)A^2d(w_1^2) \otimes d(w_1^2) \\
&\quad - (n-2)A^2|\nabla(w_1^2)|_{g_1}^2 g_1 \\
&\leq Ric_{g_1} - A(n-2)\nabla_{g_1}^2(w_1^2) - A(\Delta_{g_1}(w_1^2))g_1,
\end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

where in the last inequality, we used a general fact that $df \otimes df \leq |\nabla f|_{g_1}^2 g_1$ for any C^1 function f . The explanation is given as follows. At each x , we take a geodesic normal coordinates $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of g_1 at x . At x ,

$$(df \otimes df)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}\right) = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_k}\right)^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}\right)^2 = (|\nabla f|_{g_1}^2 g_1)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}\right),$$

which implies that $df \otimes df \leq |\nabla f|_g^2 g$ since both $df \otimes df$ and $|\nabla f|_g^2 g$ are symmetric $(0, 2)$ tensors.

For any $x_0 \in \partial M$, we take a tubular neighborhood normal coordinates $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$ of g_1 at x_0 . Then $w_1 = x_n$ near x_0 . At x_0 , by $x_n = 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{g_1}^2[(x_n)^2]\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\right) &= \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}} \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}} [(x_n)^2] - \left(\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\right) [(x_n)^2] \\
&= \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}} \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}} [(x_n)^2] - 2x_n \left(\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\right) [x_n] \\
&= \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}} \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}} [(x_n)^2] = \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}} [2x_n \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}} (x_n)] \\
&= 2\left(\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}} x_n\right) \left(\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}} x_n\right) + 2x_n \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}} \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}} x_n \\
&= 2\left(\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}} x_n\right) \left(\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}} x_n\right) = 2\delta_j^n \delta_i^n,
\end{aligned}$$

so at x_0 ,

$$\nabla_{g_1}^2[w_1^2] = \nabla_{g_1}^2[(x_n)^2] = 2dx_n \otimes dx_n \geq 0,$$

and

$$\Delta_{g_1}[w_1^2] = \Delta_{g_1}[(x_n)^2] = 2.$$

Substitute the above two into (79). At x_0 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} Ric_{g_2} &\leq Ric_{g_1} - (n-2)A\nabla_{g_1}^2(w_1^2) - A(\Delta_{g_1}(w_1^2))g_1 \\ &\leq Ric_{g_1} - 2Ag_1 \leq C_1g_1 - 2Ag_1, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 > 0$ is a universal constant depending only on (M^n, g) and independent of x_0 .

Choose $A \geq \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$. Then $Ric_{g_2}(x_0) \leq -g_1(x_0)$, which implies that $Ric_{g_2} \leq -g_1$ on ∂M , hence

$$Ric_{g_2} < 0 \quad \text{in a tubular neighborhood of } \partial M.$$

By the result in [15], there is a smooth metric g_3 on M such that

$$g_3 \equiv g_2 \quad \text{in a smaller tubular neighborhood of } \partial M,$$

and

$$Ric_{g_3} < 0 \quad \text{on } M.$$

Clearly, $h_{g_3} = h_{g_2} = 0$ on ∂M , and $Ric_{g_3} < 0$ on M implies that

$$-\lambda_{g_3}(A_{g_3}^t) \in \Gamma_n \subset \Gamma, \quad \forall t < 1.$$

Thus, by the Theorem 1.2, there exists a unique C^{4,α_0} metric $g_4 \in [g_3]$ solving

$$\begin{cases} f(-\lambda_{g_4}(A_{g_4}^t)) &= \phi, & -\lambda_{g_4}(A_{g_4}^t) \in \Gamma & \text{on } M \\ h_{g_4} &= \psi & \text{on } \partial M. \end{cases}$$

In particular, we can take $(f, \Gamma) = (\sigma_n^{\frac{1}{n}}, \Gamma_n)$, $t = 0$, and $\phi \equiv 1$, $\psi \equiv 0$. Theorem 1.3 has been established. ♣

From the arguments in the proof of Theorem 1.3, it is easy to see that for any smooth compact Riemannian manifold (M^n, g) ($n \geq 3$) with some boundary including those metrics with positive Ricci tensors, there exists some metric g_3 which is conformal to g near ∂M satisfying

$$-\lambda_{g_3}(A_{g_3}^t) \in \Gamma_n \subset \Gamma \quad \text{on } M \quad \text{and} \quad h_{g_3} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial M.$$

Thus we have the following result

Theorem 8.1 *Let (M^n, g) be an n -dimensional ($n \geq 3$) compact smooth Riemannian manifold with $\partial M \neq \emptyset$ and let $f \in C^{2,\alpha_0}(\Gamma)$ ($0 < \alpha < 1$) satisfy (5)-(9). Given $0 < \phi \in C^{2,\alpha_0}(M^n)$, $0 \geq \psi \in C^{3,\alpha_0}(\partial M)$ and for any $t < 1$, there exists a C^{4,α_0} solution $\tilde{g}$ which is conformal to g near ∂M and solves*

$$\begin{cases} f(-\lambda_{\tilde{g}}(A_{\tilde{g}}^t)) &= \phi, & -\lambda_{\tilde{g}}(A_{\tilde{g}}^t) \in \Gamma & \text{ on } M \\ h_{\tilde{g}} &= \psi & & \text{ on } \partial M. \end{cases}$$

References

- [1] T. Aubin, Équations différentielles non linéaires et problème de Yamabe concernant la courbure scalaire, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 55 (1976), 269-296.
- [2] S.Y. A. Chang, M. Gursky and P. Yang, An a priori estimate for a fully nonlinear equation on four-manifolds, J. Anal. Math. 87 (2002), 151-186.
- [3] M. Cheerier, Problèmes de Neumann non linéaires sur les variétés Riemanniennes, J. Funct. Anal. 57 (1984), 154-206.
- [4] L. Caffarelli, L. Nirenberg and J. Spruck, The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations, III. Functions of the eigenvalues of the Hessian, Acta Math. 155 (1985), 261-301.
- [5] L. P. Eisenhart, Riemannian geometry, Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1997, Eighth printing, Princeton Paperbacks.
- [6] J. F. Escobar, The Yamabe problem on manifolds with boundary, J. Differential Geom. 35 (1992), 21-84.
- [7] J. F. Escobar, Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to a constant scalar curvature metric with constant mean curvature on the boundary, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 45 (1996), 917-943.
- [8] D. Gilbarg and N.S. Trudinger, Elliptic partial differential equations of second order, reprint of the 1998 edition, Classics in Mathematics. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York (2001).
- [9] M. Gursky and J. Viaclovsky, Fully nonlinear equations on Riemannian manifolds with negative curvature, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 52 (2003), 399-420.

- [10] M. Gursky and J. Viaclovsky, Prescribing symmetric functions of eigenvalues of the Ricci tensor, *Anal. of Math.* 166 (2007), 475-531.
- [11] P. Guan and G. Wang, Local estimates for a class of fully nonlinear equations arising from conformal geometry, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 26 (2003), 1413-1432.
- [12] Z.C. Han and Y.Y. Li, The Yamabe problem on manifolds with boundaries: Existence and compactness results, *Duke Math. J.* 99 (1999), 489-542.
- [13] Z.C. Han and Y.Y. Li, The existence of conformal metrics with constant scalar curvature and constant boundary mean curvature, *Comm. Anal. Geom.* 8 (2000), 809-869.
- [14] Q. Jin, A. Li and Y.Y. Li, Estimates and existence results for a fully nonlinear Yamabe problem on manifolds with boundary, *Calc. Var. PDEs* 28 (2007), 509-543.
- [15] J. Lohkamp, Negatively Ricci curved manifolds, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* (2) 27 (1992), 288-291.
- [16] Y.Y. Li, Some existence results of fully nonlinear elliptic equations of Monge-Ampère type, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 14 (1989), 1544-1578.
- [17] A. Li and Y.Y. Li, On some conformally invariant fully nonlinear equations, Part II: Liouville, Harnack and Yamabe. *Acta Math.* 195 (2005), 117-154.
- [18] A. Li and Y.Y. Li, On some conformally invariant fully nonlinear equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* (2003), no. 10, 1416-1464.
- [19] G.M. Lieberman and N.S. Trudinger, Nonlinear oblique boundary value problems for nonlinear elliptic equations, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 295 (2) (1986), 509-546.
- [20] , W. Sheng, N.S. Trudinger and X. Wang, The Yamabe problem for higher order curvatures, *J. Diff. Geom.* 77 (2007), 515-553.
- [21] R. Schoen and S.T. Yau, On the proof of the positive mass conjecture in general relativity, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 65 (1979), 45-76
- [22] N.S. Trudinger, Remarks concerning the conformal deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa* (3) 22 (1968), 265-274.

- [23] J. Urbas, Hessian equations on compact Riemannian manifolds, in Nonlinear Problems in Mathematical Physics and Related Topics, Vol. II, 367-377. Int. Math. Ser. (N.Y.), 2. Kluwer/Plnum, New York, 2002.
- [24] H. Yamabe, On a deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds, Osaka Math. J. 12 (1960), 21-37.